

Seven rediscovered letters of Princess Elizabeth Tudor

Bryson, Alan; Evans, Melanie

DOI:

[10.1111/1468-2281.12197](https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2281.12197)

License:

None: All rights reserved

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Bryson, A & Evans, M 2017, 'Seven rediscovered letters of Princess Elizabeth Tudor', *Historical Research*, vol. 90, no. 250, pp. 829–858. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2281.12197>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Bryson, A. and Evans, M. (2017), Seven rediscovered letters of Princess Elizabeth Tudor. *Historical Research*, 90: 829–858, which has been published in final form at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-2281.12197>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Seven newly-discovered letters of Princess Elizabeth*

Alan Bryson and Mel Evans

Universities of Sheffield and Birmingham

[Several of the others are revealing about the way her people went to and from the court (Hatfield was not some cave of Abdullam.)

Although Princess Elizabeth's life is relatively well recorded, particularly during the early part of the reign of her half brother Edward VI and her detention at Woodstock in Oxfordshire in 1554-5, substantial gaps in our knowledge remain. Despite having some twenty three extant holograph letters in English, French, Italian, and Latin, and a number of other compositions in her hand, all written before her accession to the throne in 1558, these texts often tell us as much about Elizabeth's education as they do about her day-to-day life or about how she undertook her responsibilities as magnate and heir to the throne. Several of her letters to Edward, for example, are almost as notable for their display of linguistic and rhetorical skill as they are for what they reveal directly about her, and about her relationship with her brother, the king.¹ By comparison, and despite the fact that her holograph compositions have long been prized by scholars, it is the (apparently more mundane) scribal letters of Princess Elizabeth which can provide the more matter-of-fact insights into her life, illuminating how she managed her household and estate, dealt with the government, including forging alliances with some of its more prominent members, and sued for property for herself and patronage for her servants; and one or two of them are as sensational in content as any she wrote with her own hand.

Any letter from Princess Elizabeth, whether holograph or scribal, is to be valued for what new light it can shed on the years before she became queen. It is perhaps surprising, then, that only a

* A version of this article was presented at the 'Failure in the Archives' Conference, University College, London (2014). The authors are grateful to the marquis of Anglesey, the marquis of Bath, the chairman and members of the board of the British Library, and the owner of the document from a private collection for permission to publish the documents printed below. They would like to thank Simon Adams, Simon Bailey, Chris Constable, Sylvia Adamson, John Guy, Steven Gunn, Martin Kauffmann, Jane Lawson, Steven May, Juliette Pattinson, Emma Rhatigan, Zoe Stansell, Henry Summerson, Victoria Van Hyning, Graham Williams, and the Collections Manager of the private collection for their helpful advice, and the anonymous referees at *Historical Research*.

¹ For example, London, British Library, Cotton MS. Vespasian F.iii fos. 48r-v; Harley MS. 6986 fos. 21-22v.

handful of scribal letters are known to have survived from this time.² Seven more, all written by a secretary and signed by Elizabeth in her characteristic italic hand, have come to light recently.³ These are the subject of the present discussion, effectively trebling the number of known scribal letters. Four of them (Letters 1, 4, 5, and 6) were first catalogued for the Historical Manuscripts Commission in 1893 and are now in British Library, Additional Manuscript 70518.⁴ A related letter (2) is still in a private collection. The remaining two are also in private hands, one on deposit with the University of Wales, Bangor (3), the other at Longleat House in Wiltshire (7). All of them appear to have been sent, as four are addressed and sealed, one is addressed only, and one is sealed only. All are endorsed, with the exception of Letter 3 (dated April 1550), for which only the recto is preserved; nevertheless, we can assume that it too was sent, as it remains part of the family archive of its probable addressee today. None of these seven appear in George Harrison's *Letters of Queen Elizabeth* (1935), or, despite the resurgence of interest in recent years in editing Elizabeth's writings, in Leah Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose's *Collected Works* (2000).⁵ The case for publishing them here is that there is no established corpus of Elizabeth's letters, and four of our texts (3, 4, 5, and 6) date to one of the least-known parts of her life, 1549 to 1553. Every new scrap of information we can turn up on these years is, therefore, valuable, particularly as it was during this time that Elizabeth was granted her estate, her affinity coalesced round her, establishing what would become her household as queen, and she formed the two most important relationships of her life, with William Cecil and Robert Dudley, the men who would shape her government.

A small number of Princess Elizabeth's scribal letters have been printed before, although these remain little-known, being largely hidden away within nineteenth century editions of correspondence and papers. One such example is a letter sent by her to the master of revels and tents Sir Thomas Cawarden, probably dating to 1550, which assures him that he would remain steward of her manor of

² For example, Washington, D.C., Folger Shakespeare Library, MS. L.b.4; The National Archives of the U.K.: Public Record Office, SP 10/5/4 fos. 8A-8Aav (State Paper references throughout are to the microfilm copies); Brit. Libr., Cotton MS. Vespasian F.iii fos. 27r-v; Cotton MS. Vespasian F.xiii fos. 274r-v.

³ All 7 letters are written in secretary hand.

⁴ *The Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Portland, Preserved at Welbeck Abbey*, Historical Manuscripts Commission, 29 (10 vols., 1891-1931), ii, 6-9; R. J. Olney, 'The Portland Papers', *Archives*, xix (1989), 78-87.

⁵ *The Letters of Queen Elizabeth*, ed. G. B. Harrison (1935; rpt. 1968); *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, ed. L. S. Marcus, J. Mueller, and M. B. Rose (2000). Leah Marcus and Janel Mueller's follow-on volume restricts itself to holograph works, albeit it contains the same texts as its predecessor, this time not modernised (*Elizabeth I: Autograph Compositions and Foreign Language Originals*, ed. L. S. Marcus and J. Mueller (2003), xi).

Donnington in Berkshire.⁶ Like the seven printed below, this letter is omitted from the Harrison and Marcus editions. There are also letters written on Elizabeth's behalf, to which she might add a postscript and her signature. One well known example is that penned by her governess Katherine Ashley to Cecil of 2 August 1548 or 1549. Ashley explained that, 'my ladys graces secretary [and tutor Roger Ascham] beyng besy w[i]t[h] my lady about hyr lernyng: hyr grace was lothe to let hym: to wrete thes letter: wharefore hyr grace co[m]manded me to wrette'. She then petitioned on her mistress's behalf to have the ransom of the letter bearer paid, he having been captured in the war between England and Scotland. Appealing to her fellow evangelical Cecil, Elizabeth wanted him to open the subject to his master, Edward Seymour, first duke of Somerset, who was lord protector of the regency government of his nephew Edward VI. She reinforced her point to Cecil through a holograph postscript:: 'I pray you farder this pore mans sute'. There is a case for arguing that such letters were collaborative compositions—whether or not Elizabeth had actually read them before they were sent—and should be included among her correspondence.⁷ We err here on the cautious side here, though, including only the seven letters we have found that the princess composed and signed.

Elizabeth's first letter was written (appropriately enough) to Cecil from Enfield in Middlesex on 31 December 1547.⁸ Cecil had been in Somerset's service since May, probably as his master of requests, and the princess wrote on behalf of the letter bearer, Hugh Goodacre, for whom she wanted to obtain a licence to preach.⁹ Goodacre, who was probably one of Elizabeth's chaplains, 'hath been of longe

⁶ Folger Shakespeare Library, MS. L.b.4; *Loseley Manuscripts*, ed. A. J. Kempe (1836), pp. 171-3; *Cal. Pat. Rolls 1549-51*, pp. 238-42; *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1509-58*, ed. S. T. Bindoff (3 vols., 1982), i, 599-602.

⁷ Brit. Libr., Lansdowne MS. 1236 fos. 41r-v. For discussion of postscripts and of letters composed jointly, see J. Daybell, *Women Letter-Writers in Tudor England* (Oxford, 2006), pp. 2, 5, 45-6, 51, 57-8, 96-7, 108-9, 130, 146, 180, 187-8, 213, 244, 251-2, 266; A. Wiggins, 'Editing Bess of Hardwick's letters' and G. Williams, 'The language of early modern letters', in *Bess of Hardwick's Letters*, ed. A. Bryson and others (Sheffield, 2013) <<http://www.bessofhardwick.org>> [accessed 27 Feb. 2014]. Somerset was queen Jane Seymour's older brother. Original spelling and punctuation, including capitalization, are followed throughout. Editorial insertions are made in square brackets; deletions are retained; and caret marks indicate interlinear insertions.

⁸ Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518 fos. 11-12v. This letter, and the 4 others from Add. MS. 70518 (Letters 4, 5, 6, and Appendix 2) and the one from a private collection (2), was once owned by the antiquarian John Strype, who obtained it from the papers of Sir Michael Hickeys, Cecil's secretary. Presumably, Hickeys got these letters from Cecil himself (Brit. Libr., Lansdowne MS. 1238 fos. 2r-3v). He discusses it in his *Memorials of the Most Reverend Father in God Thomas Cranmer* (3 vols. in 4, Oxford, 1848-54), ii, 381-2. It is noticed also in *Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. L. Stephen and S. Lee (63 vols., 1885-1900), xxii, 114. The letter shows that Elizabeth and Cecil were in communication at least 7 months earlier than previously thought. Conyers Read, for example, dated their first contact to Aug. 1548 (*Mr. Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth* (1962), pp. 63-4).

⁹ Hertfordshire, Hatfield House (hereafter Hatfield), Cecil MS. 140/13; T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/2/4 fos. 7-8v; A. B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford, AD 1501 to 1540* (Oxford, 1974), p. 240; S. Alford, *Kingship and Politics in the Reign of Edward VI* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 80-1. Preaching was suspended for a time in Sept. 1548. It was

ty me knowen vnto vs to be aswell of honest conversation and sober lyving, as of sufficient learninge and Iudgement in the Scriptures to preache the worde of god, thadvancement wherof we so desyer, that we wishe ther were many suche to set furthe godd[e]s glory'.¹⁰ Preaching had been licensed in May 1547, when the government ordered that only those who had been vetted and approved could do anything other than read the book of homilies from their pulpits.¹¹ Significantly, despite the fact that Elizabeth was only fourteen, this was not her first correspondence with Cecil: he had obtained preaching licences on her behalf before, for example one for another of her chaplains Edmund Allen.¹² She appears to have been unsuccessful on this occasion, as Goodacre's name is not listed among those licensed to preach between July 1547 and September 1548 or between October 1550 and July 1553.¹³ Goodacre graduated BA in 1530, when he was elected fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford, and proceeded MA in 1532 and BTh by 1552. He probably left Elizabeth's service in 1548 or 1549 in order to become chaplain to the talented, if controversial, John Ponet, bishop of Rochester from 1550 and Winchester from 1551. In October 1552 he was nominated (not entirely willingly) archbishop of Armagh through the influence of Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury.¹⁴

reinstated for bishops in Aug. 1549, a few months after the first *Book of Common Prayer* had been published, but perhaps not more widely until Oct. 1550 (*Tudor Royal Proclamations*, ed. P. L. Hughes and J. F. Larkin (3 vols., 1964-9), i. 313; T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/8/43 fos. 79-80v; SP 10/8/44 fos. 81-82v; S. Brigden, *London and the Reformation* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 492-3). Somerset was removed from office in a coup on 13 Oct. 1549 (A. Bryson, "'The special men in every shere": the Edwardian regime, 1547-53' (unpublished University of St Andrews Ph.D. thesis, 2001), pp. 128-55). These two factors, the temporary preaching ban from Sept. 1548 to about Oct. 1550 and Somerset's fall in Oct. 1549, give us a *terminus ad quem*, which means that Letter 1 must date to Dec. 1547. Further evidence that the letter was written in 1547 comes from Elizabeth's 1548 New Year's gift to Edward VI, a translation of Bernardino Ochino's 'Che cosa è Christo', which she dated 30 Dec. 1547 at Enfield (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Bodley 6; University of Wales, Bangor, Paget Papers, Plas Newydd MSS. uncatalogued 2272).

¹⁰ Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518 fo. 11. Goodacre was in Elizabeth's household in 1543, although he was not described as her chaplain (T.N.A.: P.R.O., LC 2/2 fo. 48v; E 179/69/31a; E 179/69/48). The evangelical polemicist and historian John Bale offered similar praise for him to Elizabeth's (John Bale, *The vocacyon of Iohan Bale to the bishoprick of Ossorie* ([Wesel?], 1553/4; *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640*, ed. W. A. Jackson, F. S. Ferguson, and K. F. Pantzer (3 vols., 1986-91), no. 1307), sigs. C2-C3v, C6).

¹¹ T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/2/34 fos. 116r-v; *A Copie of a Lettre sent to Preachers* (1547; S.T.C., no. 9181.5); Hughes and Larkin, i. 287, 303; D. MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant. Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (1999), pp. 84-6, 233-4, ns. 52-3.

¹² Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518 fo. 11; T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/2/34 fos. 116r-v. For Allen, see F. Heal, 'Allen, Edmund (1510s-1559)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/372>> [accessed 30 Jan. 2014].

¹³ T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/2/34 fos. 116r-v; Brit. Libr., Royal MS. 18 C xxiv fos. 17, 19v, 43v, 58v, 61v, 71, 91, 92v-93, 110v, 112v, 129, 150, 162, 180, 181, 182v, 186v, 191, 204v, 211, 217, 220v, 226v, 241-242, 295v, 305v, 325v-326, 337. Other noblewomen sought preaching licences for their servants and clients at this time. For example, in May 1549 Mary Fitzroy, duchess of Richmond, petitioned the government unsuccessfully on behalf of the priests Dr Henry King, John Huntington, and Thomas Solme (T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/7/1 fos. 1-2v; SP 10/7/3 fos. 5r-v).

¹⁴ T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/13/50 fos. 98r-v; *Acts of the Privy Council of England, 1542-1631*, ed. J. R. Dasent and others (46 vols., 1890-1964) (hereafter *A.P.C.*), iv. 160; Strype, ii. 670-1. Goodacre is not listed among Elizabeth's household in the only set of accounts to survive for the reign, those for 1551-2; nor is he named in any of the extant subsidy assessments ('Household expenses of the Princess Elizabeth during her residence at Hatfield', ed. P. C. S. Smythe, Viscount Strangford, *Camden Miscellany II* (Camden old ser., lv, 1853), 1-48; T.N.A.: P.R.O., E 179/69/68; E 179/69/69; E 179/69/70).

Letter 2 was written by Elizabeth to Somerset from her principal residence at Hatfield in Hertfordshire on 10 February 1549. The bifolium document was originally part of the same archive as the four letters contained in Additional Manuscript 70518, but remained in a private collection when the others were deposited in the British Library between 1947 and 1967 as part of the Portland Loan.¹⁵ The subject of this letter was a widespread rumour that the fifteen-year-old Elizabeth was pregnant with the child of the lord high admiral Thomas, Lord Seymour of Sudeley. Seymour was the king's uncle, and Somerset's youngest brother. This scandal, part of a larger sequence of events that led to Seymour's fall, is the much-discussed subject of four famous holograph letters that Elizabeth wrote to Somerset from Hatfield between 28 January and 7 March.¹⁶

Seymour had been married to queen Katherine Parr from about June 1547. Elizabeth lived in Katherine's household from about March 1547 to May 1548.¹⁷ It was widely reported that he was a suitor for the princess's hand in marriage after Katherine's death in September 1548, something that was discouraged under the terms of Henry VIII's last will and testament, if undertaken without the permission of his executors, who now made up privy council. Such an action might even be treason, some thought.¹⁸ At the time when Elizabeth wrote Letter 2 and the four other holograph letters to Somerset, Seymour was a prisoner in the Tower of London, under investigation for plotting to obtain the office of governor of the king's person (an office held by Somerset), while simultaneously trying to persuade Edward VI to 'to take uppon himself the Gouvernement and mayning of his owne affaires'. The privy council charged that Seymour had 'fully entended and appointed to ... take ... the Kinges Majestes persone into [his] owne hands and custodie' by force.¹⁹

Many people were interrogated in February and March 1549 about their relationship with Seymour, including Elizabeth and two of her closest servants, her cofferer Thomas Parry and

¹⁵ Private Collection, fos. 9-10v. Hatfield belonged to the crown; it was not granted to Elizabeth until March 1550, but she lived there mostly from autumn 1548. She did not obtain it outright until Sept. 1550 (Bodl. Libr., MS. Smith 68 fos. 47r-v; Hatfield, Cecil MS. 150/85; *Cal. Pat. Rolls 1549-51*, pp. 238-42, 415; *A.P.C.*, iii. 52-3). Letter 2, like the 5 in Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518, once formed part of Hickes's papers and was later owned by Strype (Brit. Libr., Lansdowne MS. 1238 fos. 2r-3v).

¹⁶ Hatfield, Cecil MS. 133/4/2; Bodl. Libr., MS. Ashmole 1729 fos. 11-12v; Brit. Libr., Lansdowne MS. 1236 fos. 33-34v; Lansdowne MS. 1236 fos. 35-36v.

¹⁷ For Seymour of Sudeley, see G. W. Bernard, 'The downfall of Sir Thomas Seymour', in *The Tudor Nobility*, ed. G. W. Bernard (Manchester, 1992), pp. 212-40; Bryson 2001, pp. 81-105; J. A. Guy, *The Children of Henry VIII* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 115-23, 134.

¹⁸ Hatfield, Cecil MS. 150/43; Cecil MS. 150/79; Cecil MS. 150/85; T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/6/22 fo. 57; E 23/4/1 fos. 14v-15.

¹⁹ *A.P.C.*, ii. 247-56.

governess Kat Ashley.²⁰ The investigation into her household had begun in mid-January following revelations that Seymour had ‘practised to have in mariage the Lady Elisabeth, oone of his Majestes sisters and the secund inheritour ... to the Crown’.²¹ As a result, the government sent the gentleman of the privy chamber Sir Robert Tyrwhitt and his wife Elizabeth to Hatfield, in order to take charge of the princess’s household and examine its members. They arrived on about 20 January.²² Tyrwhitt subsequently unearthed alarming information about Elizabeth and Seymour’s relationship, especially during her residence with Katherine and him. Seymour allegedly behaved inappropriately towards her, making sexual advances on more than one occasion.²³ When at Chelsea in Middlesex, he was said to have visited her in the mornings, where he would enter her chamber before she was ready, sometimes whilst still in bed, ask her how she was, and then ‘strike hir vp[p]on the bak or on the buttock[e]s famylearly’.²⁴ Katherine once ‘cam[e] sodenly vpon them wher they were all a lone/ he having her in his armes’, after which the princess was sent away.²⁵ And in the months following the queen’s death in September 1548, Seymour made open suits through for Elizabeth’s hand through her cofferer Parry, governess Ashley, and gentlewoman Mary Cheke.²⁶

Elizabeth’s letters to Somerset—the four known holograph texts and the new scribal addition—were prompted by Tyrwhitt and his wife’s activities, including their increasing intransigency towards the princess and her household. Only her side of the correspondence is extant today.²⁷ Writing directly to Somerset offered the best means for Elizabeth to present her version of events and defend herself against accusations and slights on her honour; a strategy she would adopt again during her detention at Woodstock in 1554-5. She first wrote to him from Hatfield on 28 January, seemingly in response to a now-lost letter of his own. Elizabeth thanked the lord protector for his ‘great gentilnis, and good wil towarde me as wel in this thinge as in other thinges’. Somerset

²⁰ Hatfield, Cecil MS. 150/79; Cecil MS. 150/85; Cecil MS. 150/89; T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/6/19 fos. 51-52v; SP 10/6/20 fos. 53-54v; SP 10/6/21 fos. 55-56v; SP 10/6/22 fos. 57-59v.

²¹ *A.P.C.*, ii. 236-8.

²² Hatfield, Cecil MS. 150/100; Cecil MS. 201/67; T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/6/6 fos. 16-17v; *A.P.C.*, ii. 239-40; Bindoff, iii. 501-2; Bryson 2001, pp. 89, n. 60. Sir Robert Tyrwhitt (d. 1572) of Leighton Bromswold in Huntingdonshire is not to be confused with his nephew Robert Tyrwhitt (d. 1581) of Kettleby in Lincolnshire (Bindoff, iii. 502-3).

²³ Hatfield, Cecil MS. 150/74; Cecil MS. 150/79; Cecil MS. 150/85; T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/6/21 fo. 55.

²⁴ Hatfield, Cecil MS. 150/85; T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/6/22 fo. 58v.

²⁵ Hatfield, Cecil MS. 150/79; Cecil MS. 150/85.

²⁶ Hatfield, Cecil MS. 150/79; Cecil MS. 150/85; T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/6/22 fo. 57.

²⁷ Hatfield, Cecil MS. 150/100; Cecil MS. 201/67; T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/6/6 fos. 16-17v. Lady Elizabeth Tyrwhitt had been appointed governess in place of Ashley, which the princess resented bitterly (Hatfield, Cecil MS. 150/100).

‘willeth and counselleth me, as a earnest frende’, she said, ‘to declare what I knowe in this matter’ with Seymour.²⁸ Her letter followed his instruction, describing her conversations with Tyrwhitt, during one of which she had told Tyrwhitt about a meeting that took place between Parry and Seymour in mid-December 1548. Seymour, she wrote, had promised to obtain Durham Place as a London residence for her and offered her his own house in the city in the mean time. ‘And further[,] [Parry] sayd and asked me wether if the counsel did consente that I shulde haue [Seymour][,] wether I wolde consente to it or no.’ (Parry claimed he had only brought the subject up because he thought it was on Seymour’s mind). Elizabeth was circumspect, replying ‘I wolde not tel him what my minde was’.²⁹ Ashley was cautious also Seymour also: while she welcomed the ‘newes she harde from London’, that Elizabeth and he would marry, at All-Hallowstide she had counselled her charge not to consent to such a match without the permission of the king, Somerset, and the privy council, nor to permit Seymour to visit her on his way to the country, as he had petitioned to. Instead, Ashley offered to write to him on Elizabeth’s behalf, explaining that the princess and he could not meet ‘for feare of iuspicion [suspicion]’.³⁰ Bound up with Seymour’s wooing of the princess was his concern that she receive the estate granted to her in Henry VIII’s will (finally granted in 1550). The government believed that he wanted to obtain this land for himself through marriage, especially since his own income had been much diminished by the death of his wife and the loss of her dower estate.³¹ Concluding her 28 January letter, Elizabeth assured Somerset that she never consented to marriage, nor did Parry and Ashley say ‘that the[y] wolde practise it’. Her conscience was clear, she asserted. However, Tyrwhitt ‘and others’ had told her ‘that ther goeth rumors abrode wiche be greatly bothe agenste myne honor, and honest[y,] ... wiche be these, that I shulde am in the tower and with childe by my Lord Admiral’. ‘My Lord these ar shameful schanlders [slanders]’, Elizabeth complained, asking for permission to attend the king as soon as possible, ‘that I may shewe my selfe ^there^ as I am’.³²

Somerset wrote to Tyrwhitt in response to Elizabeth’s letter on either 28 or 29 January, giving instructions that she should co-operate with their enquiries. Two days later Tyrwhitt replied,

²⁸ Hatfield, Cecil MS. 133/4/2.

²⁹ Hatfield, Cecil MS. 133/4/2; Cecil MS. 150/79; T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/6/19 fo. 51v; Bindoff, iii. 63-5.

³⁰ Hatfield, Cecil MS. 133/4/2; T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/6/19 fos. 51-52v.

³¹ Hatfield, Cecil MS. 150/79.

³² Hatfield, Cecil MS. 133/4/2.

describing how she ‘resavyth very kyndly [your instructions] but further thene she hayth all redy wryttyne to yo[u]r grace she wyll in no weyce aknowlege as yet’. He complained that she was being evasive and truculent.³³ Somerset wrote also to Elizabeth, probably in early February. In his letter, he repeated his charge that she should confide everything about her relationship with Seymour to either Tyrwhitt or himself. Tyrwhitt communicated the same point to her in person.³⁴ Elizabeth replied on 6 February, thanking Somerset for his ‘gentil letter’ and promising to omit nothing. She preferred to report directly to him, rather than rely on Tyrwhitt—who was taking her deposition on what had passed between Seymour and her at the time—acting as intermediary. In her letter Elizabeth expressed the hope that Somerset had not ‘so yuel a[n] oppinion of me that I wolde concile any ^thinge^ that I knewe, for it wher to no purpos and surely forgetfulnis may wel cause me to hide thinges’. ‘But vndoubtedly els I wil declare al that I knowe.’³⁵ Elizabeth’s deposition on what had passed between Seymour and her was taken by Tyrwhitt at this time. She repeated this promise in her deposition, thanking the lord protector for having ‘frindely ... bothe writen to me in letters and conselled me by messages to declare what I Knowe hire in’.³⁶ Tyrwhitt sent it to Somerset on 7 February, complaining that it ‘ys not so full of matter as I wold yt war nor yet so mych as I dyd prokur her to do’. Elizabeth, Parry, Ashley, ‘they all synge onne Songe’, he said, ‘and so I thynke they could not do vnles they had sett the nott be for’.³⁷

Previously, it was thought that Elizabeth waited until 21 February to reply to a (now lost) letter or a message from Somerset. However, our Letter 2 indicates that she followed her 6 February holograph letter with a scribal one four days later, on 10 February, also sent from Hatfield. This was written in reponse to the rumours still circulating about her relationship with Seyedmour. It is a brief, formal petition, used to reminded Somerset of the content of her 28 January letter on the subject, ‘concerninge the slaunderouse rumor, sprong vp of me both in London and in other partes’. ‘These shall be to certefie your Grace that the saide rumor is not onelie not diminisshe/ but dailie more and

³³ T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/6/6 fos. 16-17v.

³⁴ Bodl. Libr., MS. Ashmole 1729 fos. 11-12v. Somerset’s letter probably postdates Tyrwhitt’s to him of 31 Jan., in which the latter describes ‘all my parswasyons wyth her all maner of ways weyinge her honor and suerty one way/ and the danger to the cyntrury’ (T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/6/6 fo. 17).

³⁵ Bodl. Libr., MS. Ashmole 1729 fo. 11.

³⁶ Hatfield, Cecil MS. 150/89.

³⁷ Hatfield, Cecil MS. 150/91.

more in all partes increasede/ to the greate infamie of my name and greife of my hart.’ Elizabeth repeated her petition to see her brother, ‘whiche thing surelie shoulde be both my greatest comfort, and also in a parte a staie for the vaine taulke of the people’. She signed her letter in her italic hand, ‘Your assured frende to my litel power Elizabeth’, appending her famous flourish at the end.³⁸

Why did Elizabeth choose to send a scribal petition on 10 February, rather than continue her holograph correspondence with Somerset? One reason might have been practical; she was prone to illness and suffered swellings in the hands as well as bad headaches that would often keep her from writing.³⁹ However, there is nothing in the scribal letter (it repeats the petitions of her previous letter) to suggest that it could not have waited a few more days if she was unable on 10 February to write in her own hand. Alternatively, therefore, her decision may represent a change of tack, perhaps to try out the persuasive formal and decorous authority of a scribal letter for her petition.⁴⁰ There are epistolary precedents: in about September 1548 Elizabeth wrote to Somerset from Cheshunt in Hertfordshire, to thank him for sending the king’s physician Dr Thomas Bill and several of his own to attend on her during a recent illness.⁴¹ Six years later, whilst at Woodstock in September 1554, Elizabeth would ask her guardian, Sir Henry Bedingfeld, to write out a letter to the privy council in his hand that she had drafted. She claimed, she ‘never wrote to yo[u]r l[ordships, the privy council] but by a secretorie. and I. am not suffered at thys tyme to haue none and therfore yow must nedes doe yt’.⁴² In the case of Letter 2, it seems that she did not provide a full draft for her secretary to copy, as we might have expected given the personal nature of the exchange with Somerset, as the text contains features typical of secretarial epistolary prose, such as demonstrative noun phrases like ‘the saide rumor’, a construction not found in any of Elizabeth’s holograph letters.⁴³

³⁸ Private Collection, fos. 9-10v.

³⁹ See, for example, Parry’s report to Cecil of Elizabeth’s ‘vnhellth’ in Sept. 1551 (T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/8/63 fos. 115-116v).

⁴⁰ James Daybell observes that letters of petition tended to follow epistolary convention by being scribal rather than holograph, in part because of the formulaic deference associated with a secretarial hand (*The Material Letter in Early Modern England: Manuscript Letters and the Culture and Practices of Letter-Writing, 1512-1635* (Basingstoke, 2012), pp. 86-9).

⁴¹ T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/5/4 fos. 8A-8Aav; LC 2/2/3/1 fo. 116; E 179/69/62; E 179/69/63.

⁴² Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 34563 fos. 50-51v; C. R. Manning, ‘State papers, relating to the custody of the Princess Elizabeth at Woodstock, in 1554’, *Norfolk Archaeology*, iv (1855), 133-231, at pp. 211-2.

⁴³ For a discussion of the language of Elizabeth’s holograph letters, see M. Evans *The Language of Queen Elizabeth I: a Sociolinguistic Perspective on Royal Style and Identity* (Chichester, 2013), *passim*.

Somerset replied to Elizabeth's 10 February letter some time over the next few weeks, clearly irritated by its content. He repeated his 'mynde in this thinge', that she should declare everything that had happened between Seymour and her.⁴⁴ She wrote back in her own hand on 21 February, declaring that, although she was 'verye sorie that you shulde take [her letter] so', she had followed his counsel 'to be plaine with you in al thinges'. Where Somerset accused her of 'sem[ing] to stande in my none witte in beinge so wel assured of my none selfe', Elizabeth countered 'I did assure me of my selfe nomore than I trust the trueth shal trie'. 'And to say that wiche I knewe of my selfe I did not thinke shulde haue displeased the counsel or your grace.' The letter again addressed the rumours against her, which Elizabeth now described as seditious because 'the people wil say that I deserued throwgh my lewde demenure to haue suche a one'. Having failed to obtain an audience with the king, she tried to achieve her aims through her letter instead. She pointed out to Somerset that one of the government's principal duties was to maintain order, in this case by publicly refuting the stories circulating against her. What is more, in his last will Henry had instructed his executors (now the privy council) to oversee Elizabeth's marriage, but also implicitly to protect and support her. She reminded Somerset how 'you and the counsel ar charged with me', and yet, they had done nothing constructive to scotch the rumours, despite her appeals.⁴⁵ He had told her to 'bringe forthe anye that had reported it', and the privy council and he would 'se it redreste'. This 'shulde be but a bridinge of a iuel name of me'. Her most pressing concern was to preserve her reputation, particularly in the face of such public scrutiny. Therefore, she needed open support from the government and petitioned Somerset for a proclamation to be issued against those who defamed her, commanding the common people to refrain from spreading lies. She assured him that she had no intention of breaking the terms of the 1544 Succession Act (35 Hen. VIII, c. 1) or of her father's will by marrying without the consent of either Edward or his privy council. Therefore, no understanding had taken place between Seymour and her. However, she believed that Somerset doubted her word on this, which is why, she thought, he would not support her

⁴⁴ Somerset's letter does not survive and we must reconstruct its content from Elizabeth's reply of 21 Feb. (Brit. Libr., Lansdowne MS. 1236 fos. 33-34v).

⁴⁵ Brit. Libr., Lansdowne MS. 1236 fos. 33-34v; T.N.A.: P.R.O., E 23/4/1 fos. 7-8v, 9v-10, 14v-15. Somerset and his colleagues regarded the will as the foundation of the minority government, something that Elizabeth well understood (see T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/1/1 fos. 1-2v).

publicly.⁴⁶ Elizabeth's petition worked, though, and the government agreed to issue a proclamation against the rumour-mongering.⁴⁷

Emboldened by this success, the princess wrote about the matter one the last time on 7 March.⁴⁸ Ashley and Parry had been dismissed from her service on 21 January and imprisoned in the Tower, where they were interrogated regularly.⁴⁹ Now, although she did not 'fauor her iuel doinge', Elizabeth asked for Ashley to be released and reinstated. She justified her suit by explaining that Ashley had served her for a long time, taking 'great labor, and paine in brinkinge of me vp in lerninge and honestie', here probably alluding to Saint Gregory of Nazianzus's funeral oration on Saint Basil the Great that we are more bound to those who bring us up well than to our parents. The letter posits that Ashley would never have encouraged Seymour's suit if she had not believed genuinely that he had the support of his privy council colleagues in it, she having counselled Elizabeth many times never to consent to marriage without their permission. Lastly, Elizabeth asserted that if Ashley was not released, the people would say that the servant was sacrificing her own freedom to protect the mistress from guilt. 'Thus hope preuailinge more with me than feare hathe wone the battel, and I haue at this time gone furth with it.' She ended with a postscript on behalf of another servant, Kat Ashley's husband John, who had also been dismissed and imprisoned in the Fleet over the affair; would Somerset act as his good lord, 'wiche bicause he is my kindesman I wold be glad he shulde dow'?⁵⁰ Elizabeth's petition was eventually successful. John and Kat Ashley may have been released and reinstated as early as the summer, and certainly by October 1551; while Parry was back in service even sooner, September 1549.⁵¹ On 25 February 1549 a bill of attainder against Seymour was introduced into parliament, passing both houses almost unopposed on 5 March (2 & 3 Edw. VI, c. 18). He was found guilty of treason and beheaded at Tower Hill on 20 March.⁵²

Elizabeth's third letter was written from Enfield on 21 April 1550, almost certainly to William, first Lord Paget, in whose family archive it remained until its disappearance in 1927. Only a

⁴⁶ Brit. Libr., Lansdowne MS. 1236 fos. 33r-v; see Hatfield, Cecil MS. 150/89.

⁴⁷ The proclamation was apparently issued between 21 Feb. and 7 March, but no longer survives (Brit. Libr., Lansdowne MS. 1236 fos. 35-36v).

⁴⁸ Brit. Libr., Lansdowne MS. 1236 fos. 35-36v.

⁴⁹ Hatfield, Cecil MS. 201/67; *A.P.C.*, ii. 239-40.

⁵⁰ Brit. Libr., Lansdowne MS. 1236 fos. 35-36v; *A.P.C.*, ii. 240; Bindoff, i. 345-6; Marcus and Mueller, p. 23, n. 2.

⁵¹ Brit. Libr., Lansdowne MS. 1236 fos. 41r-v; Add. MS. 70518 fos. 9-10v; T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/8/63 fos. 115-116v; Strangford, pp. 4, 31-4, 41.

⁵² Bernard, p. 230.

photograph of the recto is extant today, on deposit with the University of Wales, Bangor. The original letter was scribal. In it the sixteen-year-old Elizabeth complained about ‘the demaunde of one that names hymselfe to be yo[u]r s[er]uant’ for certain land that she claimed as part of a manor granted to her in March 1550 under the terms of her father’s will. The manor in question appears to have been Enfield itself, which was part of the duchy of Lancaster. She described how ‘certen ground[e]s ... allwayes weis wont to lye aparte for the prouysion of this house aswell in M[aste]r Lovell[e]s daies and my lord of Rutland[e]s as also in latter days sythens’. (Sir Thomas Lovell and his great nephew Thomas Manners, first earl of Rutland, had owned Elsings in Enfield in turn from the fourteen-nineties to the late fifteen-thirties, when it was exchanged with the crown.)⁵³ Elizabeth probably appealed to Paget because he was chancellor of the duchy and thus had the authority to grant or reject her suit for Enfield. Without the land, she worried that she would be unable to run her household in ‘this dere tyme’. ‘And my trust is that ye will for my sake rather procure more for me then ones consent to my hynderaunce/ especially when my necessitie is this touched/ And that ye will rather also bere toward[e]s me then toward[e]s yo[u]r owne [man] vnto whome for yo[u]r sake ... I wilbe gladd otherwayes to do a good torne vnto’.⁵⁴ This bargaining strategy, which reads somewhat assertively, forms part of the *peroratio* or conclusion to Elizabeth’s request.⁵⁵ ‘It shuld litell content me tunderstand that s[er]uant[e]s shuld be ony occasion of onkyndenes w[hi]che in ^suche^ cases somtyme myghte be engendryd,’ she concluded, before adding in her own hand her standard scribal-letter subscription ‘Your louinge frende Elizabeth’.⁵⁶

Letter 4 was written from Hatfield on 20 May 1552, when Elizabeth was eighteen, to an unknown addressee.⁵⁷ The content suggests that he was almost certainly Thomas, first Lord Darcy of

⁵³ Plas Newydd MSS. uncatalogued 2272; *Cal. Pat. Rolls 1549-51*, pp. 238-42; S. J. Gunn, ‘Lovell, Sir Thomas (c. 1449-1524)’, *O.D.N.B.* <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/17065>> [accessed 1 Nov. 2011]; M. M. Norris, ‘Manners, Thomas, first earl of Rutland (c. 1497-1543)’, *O.D.N.B.* <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/17963>> [accessed 21 May 2014].

⁵⁴ Plas Newydd MSS. uncatalogued 2272; R. Somerville, *History of the Duchy of Lancaster* (1953), pp. 612-3; Bindoff, iii. 42-6. The identity of Paget’s servant is unknown. John Dudley, earl of Warwick, had been appointed the duchy of Lancaster master forester of Enfield in succession to Paget in Nov. 1549. The duchy bailiff Sir Thomas Wroth of Durants in Enfield was his man, not Paget’s (Somerville, pp. 612-3; Bindoff, iii. 666-8). 1550 was a year of high inflation, crop failure, and dearth (W. K. Jordan, *Edward VI: the Protectorate of the Duke of Somerset* (1968), pp. 398-9; *Edward VI: the Threshold of Power. The Dominance of the Duke of Northumberland* (1970), pp. 471-5).

⁵⁵ On the rhetorical structures of 16th century petitionary letters, see F. Whigham, ‘The rhetoric of Elizabethan suitors’ letters’, *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, xcvi (1981), 864-82.

⁵⁶ Plas Newydd MSS. uncatalogued 2272.

⁵⁷ Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518 fos. 8r-v.

Chiche, who had been lord chamberlain since April 1551.⁵⁸ The scribal letter is a petition on behalf of the bearer, Elizabeth's servant Anthony Wingfield the younger. Elizabeth wanted the addressee 'to vse yo[u]r friendeshipp ... in reveling our desire in this case to the King[e]s Mat[ies]tie' that Wingfield be appointed to replace his brother Robert Wingfield, who had decided to give up his ordinary attendance at court as a gentleman usher daily waiter.⁵⁹

Robert and Anthony Wingfield were the sons of the comptroller of the royal household and captain of the guard Sir Anthony Wingfield of Letheringham in Suffolk, and his wife, Elizabeth. Sir Anthony Wingfield died on 15 August 1552, but the context of Elizabeth's letter suggests that he was still alive when she wrote it. Robert Wingfield was listed as a gentlemen usher in April 1552, but was a quarter not a daily waiter. He is omitted from a household list drawn up some time later that year, which suggests that Letter 4 should be dated 20 May 1552, by which time he was no longer an ordinary.⁶⁰ Anthony Wingfield the younger is described, favourably and effusively, by Elizabeth as 'a man for his honestie/ sobrietie/ and vertuous qualities woorthie moch commendac[i]on/ and a man in deede very painfull/ diligent/ skilfull/ and serviceable/ very meete to serue in that, or in any other lyke place of p[re]ferment about his highnes'. She asked that the addressee 'most humbly besech ... his highnes taccept him from vs accordingly' and to be 'his singulare good Lorde', signing her letter 'Your Louinge fre[n]de. Elizabeth'.⁶¹ Elizabeth was successful in her suit, confirming her increasingly secure status and growing influence: Anthony Wingfield the younger is numbered among the gentleman usher daily waiters on a list drawn up some time later that year, and was a quarter waiter by the time of the king's funeral.⁶²

Letter 5, written from Ashridge in Buckinghamshire on 16 July 1552, was definitely addressed to Darcy.⁶³ The text suggests that Elizabeth had made several petitions to him in recent months, which would fit with our attribution of him as the addressee of Letter 4, written eight weeks earlier. The lord

⁵⁸ Bindoff, ii. 14-6; see Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518 fo. 13.

⁵⁹ Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518 fo. 8; Strangford, p. 39. Gentleman usher daily waiters were members of the household above stairs who took a leading role in the organization of the ceremonial life of the court (*Religion, Politics, and Society in Sixteenth-Century England*, ed. I. W. Archer and others (Camden Soc., 5th ser., xxii, 2003), pp. 6-7).

⁶⁰ T.N.A.: P.R.O., E 179/69/64; London, Society of Antiquaries, MS. 125 fos. 29v-30r; Brit. Libr., Stowe MS. 571 fos. 30r-v; Bindoff, iii. 638-40; *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons, 1558-1603*, ed. P. W. Hasler (3 vols., 1981), iii. 640.

⁶¹ Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518 fo. 8.

⁶² Society of Antiquaries, MS. 125 fos. 29v-30r; Brit. Libr., Stowe MS. 571 fos. 30r-v; T.N.A.: P.R.O., LC 2/4/1 fo. 20.

⁶³ Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518 fos. 13-14v. Ashridge was one of Elizabeth's principal residences, granted to her in March 1550 (*Cal. Pat. Rolls 1549-51*, pp. 238-42).

chamberlain was employed frequently by the new head of the regency government, John Dudley, duke of Northumberland, in order to obtain the king's signature to letters, warrants, bills, etc. Elizabeth recognized Darcy's proximity to her brother and Northumberland, which is why she wrote to him asking for favour. Letter 5 includes two separate petitions, each reflecting Elizabeth's growing responsibilities as magnate and sister to the king. The first concerned her cousin Henry Carey of Buckingham, asking if he could be found a better place at court. Carey had been a member of the royal household since before May 1545, although in what post is unclear, as his name does not appear in any of its records. This is evidently not the first petition Elizabeth had made to Darcy on Carey's behalf, as she observed that Carey 'vndesired' whatever alternative place the lord chamberland had offered him in response to her earlier request. Thus Elizabeth petitioned for him again in Letter 5, asking if Darcy could 'exercise [Carey] in s[er]vice of the King[e]s Maiestie' for her 'great pleas[u]r'. As with her previous letter, concerning the promotion of Anthony Wingfield the younger, her account of the main subject of this letter Carey is superlative: 'ye shall finde him, most dilligent, and towerd, for the p[u]rpose, that waie: and vnto youe as trustie, faithfull, and redie, as ye haue most bounden[n] him'.⁶⁴

Elizabeth's second suit concerned the bearer of the letter. Both Carey and she 'co[m]mend[ed]' 'the sauffety and the Cure of a poore mann', whom Elizabeth described as her 'frend, that moste p[ar]te of his lief, hathe s[e]rued my kynne', the Boleyn and Carey families. The unidentified man in question had stood surety for Sir John Butler of Great Badminton in Gloucestershire in the sum of £10 to Sir Robert Dormer of London, for some silk. The debt remained unpaid at Butler's death in 1552 and, when Dormer himself died on either 2 or 8 July, his executors demanded it of the surety, on whose behalf Elizabeth and Carey were now suing. The surety was unable to pay and had been outlawed as a result, 'and so he, and his, vtterlie vndonne for ever'. Elizabeth asked Darcy to obtain his pardon from the king, knowing full well how close he was to

⁶⁴ Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518 fo. 13. Carey was the only son of William Carey of Aldenham in Hertfordshire, and his wife, Mary, elder daughter of Thomas Boleyn, earl of Wiltshire and Ormond. Anne Boleyn was his aunt, while Henry VIII may have been his father, which would make Elizabeth his half-sister as well as cousin. In 1585 he was appointed lord chamberlain (Bindoff, i. 582-3).

Northumberland.⁶⁵ Finally, Carey was also sent to court to speak in person to Darcy about Elizabeth's manor of Donnington, namely concerning 'some disordres in thes p[ar]tes. Wherof [she] wolde be glad to haue [his] advise and aide'. She signed her letter 'Your louinge fre[n]de Elizabeth'.⁶⁶ Her petition on her cousin's behalf was successful: he was appointed carver of the privy chamber later that year.⁶⁷ The fate of the unfortunate letter bearer is unclear.

Letter 6 was written to Cecil from Hatfield on 19 March 1553, a few months before the end of the reign.⁶⁸ Like majority of the other letters edited here, it concerned Elizabeth's estate, of which she had made Cecil surveyor by early July 1550. Elizabeth had taken something of a risk in her appointment of him, as Cecil was only just emerging from disgrace as part of a wider *détente* between Somerset and Northumberland. Cecil had been arrested during the 1549 October coup against his master, but was restored to favour in summer 1550, alongside Somerset.⁶⁹ His rehabilitation culminated in appointment as principal secretary in September 1550, placing him at the heart of government. Indeed, he became Northumberland's 'man of business'.⁷⁰

The nineteen-year-old Elizabeth began her March 1553 letter to 'Gentill M[aste]r Cicell' by thanking him for his continued good will and for the care he had always taken over her affairs. She then set out her concerns regarding 'a private matter'. Her interests had been 'yll handeled' of late by others, she wrote, and 'now ... am I so extremelie handled, As therbie, yf spedie remedie be not had, I am like to susteine no small dishono[u]r'. This was because 'a yong man[,] being Learned', called Thomas Caius had 'obteyned' the post of master of the almshouse and grammar school at Ewelme in Oxfordshire, before it had been granted to her as part of the lordship of Ewelme in March 1550.⁷¹

The foundation statutes for the almshouse and grammar school provided for two chaplains and for thirteen poor men who lived in Ewelme, and in the manors of Marsh Gibbon in Buckinghamshire,

⁶⁵ Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518 fos. 13r-v; T.N.A.: P.R.O., PROB 11/35 sig. 26; Hasler, i. 521; Bindoff, ii. 52-4. On the close relations between Northumberland and Darcy see D. E. Hoak, *The King's Council During the Reign of Edward VI* (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 55-8, 124, 142-4, 249, 263, 320, n. 158, 321, n. 163.

⁶⁶ Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518 fo. 13v.

⁶⁷ Society of Antiquaries, MS. 125 fo. 30r; Brit. Libr., Stowe MS. 571 fo. 30v; T.N.A.: P.R.O., LC 2/4/1 fo. 19v.

⁶⁸ Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518 fos. 31-32v.

⁶⁹ T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/10/12 fos. 26-27v; Brit. Libr., Lansdowne MS. 118 fo. 23; Read, p. 64; Bryson 2001, pp. 151, 170-2, 174, 176-8, 181-8.

⁷⁰ Hoak, pp. 136-9, 142-44; quotation at S. Alford, *The Early Elizabethan Polity. William Cecil and the British Succession Crisis, 1558-1569* (Cambridge, 1998), p. 14; *Kingship and Politics in the Reign of Edward VI* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 139-41.

⁷¹ Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518 fos. 31r-v; *Cal. Pat. Rolls 1549-51*, pp. 238-42; *Victoria County History of Oxfordshire*, ii. 156.

Conock in Wiltshire, and Ramridge in Hampshire. One of the chaplains, preferably a graduate of the University of Oxford, was to be appointed master and paid £10 a year; the other was to teach the boys of Ewelme and of Marsh Gibbon, Conock, and Ramridge their grammar in return for £3 8*d*. As lord of the manor of Ewelme, Elizabeth became patron of the two livings from spring 1550.⁷² However, she found that Caius had been named master for life in February 1549, and licensed to enjoy the post even though not yet ordained.⁷³ Upon his appointment, Caius, ‘w[i]thout all respect of honestie, And w[i]thout all considerac[i]on of his Dutie towerdes the poore of that house’, had embezzled some of its revenue, along with all the jewels, plate, and ornaments. Worse still, he had conveyed into his own hands several of the manors that made up its endowment, felling and selling the timber on them and granting copyholds to ‘Strangers’ rather than to the customary tenants. His ‘Complices’ and he hoped to obtain a private act of parliament in order to have the Weyhill fair moved (even though it had been held at Ramridge for 400 years) to Andover in Hampshire instead, ‘to the vtter ruyne of the poore ten[a]nt[e]s and Inh[ab]itant[e]s therabout[e]s for ever’.⁷⁴ ‘The other enormyt[ie]s, donne by him, ar to longe to write/ wherfore for this tyme I omytt them’, Elizabeth told Cecil.⁷⁵

Elizabeth had considered, as lord of the manor, carrying out a visitation of Ewelme, with the main purpose of having Caius replaced once his unfitness for office had been determined. However, she decided to wait and see what Cecil could do for her instead, sending one of her servants George Tresham to put her case to him. She asked Cecil ‘to vse this matter for me, As I may haue some due meanes to reforme this from the Roote vpward’. She wanted the Weyhill fair to remain where it was, petitioning Cecil to stay any private act of parliament to have it moved. ‘For the residue’, Elizabeth asked for Cecil’s counsel on ‘howe I may best wade therin as maie app[er]teine to myne hono[u]r’.⁷⁶

⁷² The almshouse and grammar school were founded between 1437 and 1448-50. By 1442 they had been endowed with the manors of Marsh Gibbon, Conock, and Ramridge (*Victoria County History of Oxfordshire*, ii. 156).

⁷³ *Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1548-9*, p. 225. The master was to be chosen by the lord of the manor of Ewelme, but who appointed Caius is unknown. He was described in 1549 as ‘a great friend’ of Henry Grey, third marquis of Dorset, which might explain his nomination (*Victoria County History of Oxfordshire*, ii. 156; *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation*, ed. H. Robinson (2 vols., Parker Soc., xxxvii-xxxviii, Cambridge, 1846-7), ii. 394).

⁷⁴ Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518 fos. 31-32; Hatfield, Cecil MS. 151/85.

⁷⁵ Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518 fo. 31v.

⁷⁶ Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518 fos. 31v-32. Tresham acted as letter bearer on a regular basis, for example in Oct. 1552. He is probably George Tresham of Newton-in-the-Willows, Northamptonshire, gentleman waiter to Prince Edward from 1545-7, or his kinsman and namesake, the third son of Sir Thomas Tresham of Rushton in Northamptonshire (T.N.A.: P.R.O., LC 2/2/3/1 fo. 96; SP 10/15/17 fos. 37-38v; Hatfield, Cecil MS. 151/85; Bindoff, iii. 481-2).

In the mean time, Elizabeth had summoned Caius ‘to aunswere to thobiect[e]s, who as he is some thing learened, So yt app[er]ith well, he is nothing at all meate for the Rome’.⁷⁷ On 7 April 1553 Parry also wrote to Cecil about Caius on her behalf. He reiterated the same points that Elizabeth had made in her scribal letter three weeks early, about the man’s ‘lewde demeno[u]r’ as master of the almshouse and grammar school. Something had to be done soon, so ‘that the saide fundac[i]on ... come not to p[er]ptuall Ruine’.⁷⁸ Therefore, Elizabeth had decided to order a visitation to be made after all, appointing Cecil alongside the evangelical Sir John Kingsmill of Sydmonton in Hampshire, Richard Bridges of West Shefford in Berkshire, Roger Young, and two of her servants, Thomas Benger and George Tresham.⁷⁹ She had also instructed Kingsmill and Bridges to visit Conock and Ramridge in order to survey the ‘wast[e]s & distructions done’ there and to prevent any further embezzlement from taking place. They found, for example, that Caius had felled 380 elm trees at Conock, using some of the timber for the construction of his nearby parsonage, and selling the remainder for £35 2s. He had leased the reversion of the farm ‘vnto one Huncle[,] a compayon of Oxford of his owne’, abetted in this action by the corrupt schoolmaster of Ewelme ‘John Squipe’. At Ramridge he sold even more timber, including 355 trees in Ramridge Wood, 160 in a nearby copice, and 335 on the tenants’ land. Lastly, he took a chalice from the church of St Michael in Weyhill, which was valued at £6, leaving £2 for it, ‘not having ony co[n]sent of the p[ar]isshe’ to do so.⁸⁰

Elizabeth’s disparagement of Caius’s character seemed justified. A fellow of University College, Oxford, he appears to have been a difficult and venal man. In 1551 he was nominated by the king’s commissioners as master of the college, only for the fellows to refuse him, electing George Ellison instead. Caius had been registrar of the university since 1534 but was ousted by convocation for negligence in 1552. After the vote he stormed out of the room, punching one of the other fellows, Henry Walshe of Corpus Christi College, in the face. Caius was imprisoned overnight as a result, and

⁷⁷ Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518 fo. 32; Hatfield, Cecil MS. 151/85.

⁷⁸ Hatfield, Cecil MS. 151/85.

⁷⁹ Hatfield, Cecil MS. 151/85. Benger was auditor of Elizabeth’s household by Sept. 1552 (Bindoff, i. 534-5; Hasler, i. 427-8; R. H. Fritze, “A rare example of godlynesse amongst gentlemen”: the role of the Kingsmill and Gifford families in promoting the reformation in Hampshire’, in *Protestantism and the National Church in Sixteenth Century England*, ed. P. Lake and M. Dowling (1987), pp. 144-61, at pp. 145-9, 154).

⁸⁰ Hatfield, Cecil MS. 151/85.

only released when he apologized to convocation and paid a substantial fine.⁸¹ Perhaps sensing her moment, in February 1552 Elizabeth had had her tutor Johannes Spithoff [Spithovius], who was described as ‘vir pius et eruditus’, admitted to the parish church at Ewelme as rector.⁸² And she drove Caius out in August 1554: he was replaced by John Peerson after his ‘free resignation’ of the post, thus demonstrating Elizabeth’s increasing control over the lordship of Ewelme and over her estate.⁸³

It is important to recognize that estate management was a political act. Landowners were often under great pressure to protect and preserve their property from rivals. For example, Katherine Parr complained about the fact that, in the aftermath of her clandestine marriage to Seymour, much of her dower estate was granted in reversion in 1547 and 1548; and Somerset spent 1547 and 1548 trying to secure the inheritance of Lady Katherine de Vere by negotiating her marriage to his younger son and pressuring her father John de Vere, fifteenth earl of Oxford, into not remarrying himself.⁸⁴ Elizabeth had had to wait until March 1550 before she received the estate granted to her in her father’s will. She was determined to preserve it from those who might prey on it, as shown by the seven letters discussed here. It also helps to explain why Parry stayed at the Bull Inn during her detention at Woodstock in 1554-5, where he continued to pay Elizabeth’s household expenses and manage her estate, seeing large numbers of her servants on her business daily, vigilantly protecting and enforcing her rights. So great were the numbers resorting to the Bull, that Elizabeth’s keeper during her house arrest, Bedingfeld, complained to the privy council, and they tried to put a stop to it.⁸⁵

Elizabeth’s seventh letter was written from Hatfield to Sir John Thynne of Longleat in Wiltshire on 27 February 1556, when she was twenty two.⁸⁶ During Edward’s reign, Thynne was widely recognized as Somerset’s closest and most important servant, enduring long periods in prison in 1549-50 and 1551-2 as a result, and Elizabeth recruited him (like Cecil) into her service from the

⁸¹ Emden, pp. 189, 325-6, 603-4, 723; D. R. Leader, ‘Caius [Kay, Key], Thomas (c. 1505-1572)’, *O.D.N.B.* <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4352>> [accessed 27 May 2014].

⁸² ‘Johannes Spitharius (CCed Person ID 99639)’, *The Clergy of the Church of England Database 1540-1835* <<http://www.theclergydatabase.org.uk>> [accessed 31 May 2014]; see S. Adams and D. S. Gehring, ‘Elizabeth I’s former tutor reports on the parliament of 1559: Johannes Spithovius to the chancellor of Denmark, 27 February 1559’, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, cxxviii (2013), 35-54, at pp. 35-8, 41-3, 47. Spithoff may have been the same man as ‘John Squipe’, who the tenants of Conock had described as schoolmaster of Ewelme in their depositions to Sir John Kingsmill and Richard Bridges in spring 1553. This would make him one of Caius’s cronies (Hatfield, Cecil MS. 151/85).

⁸³ *Cal. Pat. Rolls 1554-5*, p. 211.

⁸⁴ Bryson 2001, pp. 84-5, 94, 149, 252-4.

⁸⁵ Manning, pp. 194, 196; D. Starkey, *Elizabeth: Apprenticeship* (2000), pp. 155-6; J. Hughes, ‘Parry, Sir Thomas (b. in or before 1515, d. 1560)’, *O.D.N.B.* <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21433>> [accessed 3 July 2015].

⁸⁶ Wiltshire, Longleat House (hereafter Longleat), Thynne MS. 1 fos. 4-5v.

duke's household. Thynne was appointed comptroller of her household some time late in 1553, immediately 'before [the] distresse & duresse' of her imprisonment in the Tower early in 1554 for her alleged complicity in Wyatt's Rebellion.⁸⁷

The mid-fifteen-fifties were dangerous times for Elizabeth, and she put great store in Thynne's loyalty and capability. She had petitioned him in late January 1556 to join the rest of her affinity in London in a show of strength 'for her libertie'; that is, against her exclusion from the succession (which was something that her sister Mary I was contemplating at the time). 'Ye shall not only doo therin a dede of w[o]rshipp to y[o]urself. But a deade merytoryouse to god and vnto her', Thynne was told. 'This is a tyme wherein a s[er]uante ought to shewe suche good redynes as maye apperteine.' The proposed demonstration was abandoned, but so too was any attempt in parliament to exclude Elizabeth from the succession.⁸⁸

The following month, Elizabeth made another request to Thynne. She asked him to try to persuade his friend the Lincoln's Inn lawyer and fellow evangelical Richard Kingsmill to enter her service. Thynne duly made overtures to Kingsmill, while 'com[m]end[ing] [his] wisdom and approved faithfulnes' in a (now lost) letter to the princess.⁸⁹ Letter 7, written on 27 February, thanked him for his efforts on her behalf and asking him to 'travaill' with Kingsmill to join her household as soon as possible. 'Yf ye shall think it expedient', Thynne could explain that he would only be expected to serve on a quarterly basis, 'that who soeu[e]r be ~~myne~~ ovr officer shall not be tyed to contynewall residence in o[u]r house as therby he shuld be dryven to dissolue his howse and famylie & the state therof'. Elizabeth concluded her letter to Thynne 'ye know sufficiently the state we ar in and also what behoves vs', suggesting a sustained correspondence between them and giving some insight into his close service relationship with her.⁹⁰ Letter 7 is, like that to Darcy, an indication of Elizabeth's social positioning alongside men of power and influence. It further indicates the role that

⁸⁷ Longleat, Thynne MS. 2 fos. 192-193v; Thynne MS. 2 fos. 243-244v; Bindoff, iii. 463-7.

⁸⁸ Longleat, Thynne MS. 2 fos. 243-244v; Guy, pp. 164-8; see Thynne MS. 1 fo. 4.

⁸⁹ Longleat, Thynne MS. 1 fos. 4-5v. Kingsmill was the second son of Sir John Kingsmill of Sydmonton in Hampshire, also a Lincoln's Inn lawyer, and his wife, Constance. Sir John had been among the visitors appointed to investigate Caius in spring 1553 (Hatfield, Cecil MS. 151/85; Hasler, ii. 400-1; Fritze, p. 150).

⁹⁰ Longleat, Thynne MS. 1 fo. 4. Thynne maintained a regular correspondence with Elizabeth through Parry and in Nov. 1558 offered to raise the west country for her in order to ensure the succession. Parry wrote on 11 Nov. to tell him that 'yo[u]r reme[m]branc[e]s and travaille ar taken in moste thankfull p[ar]te' by Elizabeth (Longleat, Thynne MS. 3 fos. 21-22v; Thynne MS. 3 fos. 23r-v; Thynne MS. 3 fo. 24r-v).

letters of petition played in advancing her own interests, establishing networks of support and of counsel in the years before her accession in 1558.

Additional Manuscript 70518 contains another letter relating to Princess Elizabeth, written at her 'com[m]and' by Parry to Cecil from Hatfield on either Friday 20 September 1549 or Friday 20 September 1555.⁹¹ The letter, printed here as Appendix 2, probably dates to the former rather than the latter year because Elizabeth was recorded at court between 4 September and 18 October 1555, and could not have been resident at Hatfield at the time. Also, it is addressed 'to the right worshipfull M[aste]r Cicil Esquier', without reference to his 1551 knighthood. Although Parry might have been at Hatfield with the majority of Elizabeth's household at the time, while she herself was with the court at Greenwich Palace in Kent, he ended his letter, 'vpon wensday com[e] sevenyght does her gr[a]c[e] remove to Asheridge/ god willing'. This would be either 2 October 1549 or 2 October 1555.⁹² In another letter to Cecil, written from Hatfield on 22 September 1549, Parry had informed him that Elizabeth would remove to Ashridge in ten or twelve days time, between 2-4 October. He wrote to Cecil again from Hatfield three days later.⁹³ Finally, although Parry never said in his 20 September letter that he was with the princess, the content suggests that he was: he explained how she had 'com[m]anded me to write her hartie com[m]e[n]dacions & thank[e]s vnto youe', 'also com[m]anded me to say to you, that she assureth you', 'she desires you to adu[er]tise her'.

Parry began his 20 September letter by thanking Cecil on Elizabeth's behalf for accepting her servant Richard Bryce into his own household.⁹⁴ He then turned to his main subject, 'her gr[a]c[e]s stile'. Elizabeth 'desireth you to take som[e] leysen' over it, 'and to devise ... that as ye shall thinke good', Parry informed him. Cecil should then send it 'close in writing' by the trusted letter bearer, after which the princess would decide what to do.⁹⁵ She had been declared illegitimate and deprived of her royal title by the 1536 Succession Act (28 Hen. VIII, c. 7) and had been known ever since as the

⁹¹ The letter is dated 'friday' and endorsed 'xxth Septemb[er]', which puts it in either 1549 or 1555: Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518 fos. 9-10v.

⁹² *The Diary of Henry Machyn*, ed. J. G. Nichols (Camden Soc., old ser., xlii, 1848), p. 94; F. A. Mumby, *The Girlhood of Queen Elizabeth* (London, 1909), pp. 200-1. The court was at Greenwich on 20 Sept. 1555, if that was the date on which Parry wrote to Cecil (A.P.C., v. 181-2).

⁹³ T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/8/63 fos. 115-116v; SP 10/8/64 fos. 117-118v.

⁹⁴ Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518 fo. 9. Bryce was deputy keeper of Hatfield (T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/10/12 fos. 26-27v; Strangford, pp. 2, 22-4, 44).

⁹⁵ Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518 fo. 9.

Lady Elizabeth.⁹⁶ She was rehabilitated soon after Seymour's fall, however, and appears to have turned to Cecil in autumn 1549 in search of a more impressive style, one that recognized her status as princess and as heir to the throne. This is the subject of Parry's September letter.⁹⁷

Cecil's solution was ingenious, as shown in a charter drawn up in March 1558, leasing some of Elizabeth's lands to him. She signed and sealed this document. The seal, which bore a Tudor rose and the legend 'S[IGILLUM] ELIZABETHE SOROR[IS] EDWARDI REGIS [the seal of Elizabeth, king Edward's sister]', appears to have been new. It is the only known example of Elizabeth's seal from before she became queen. By invoking kinship with Edward, she arrogated the status of princess without explicitly saying so.⁹⁸ 'FILIA HENRICUS REGIS' had probably been judged too provocative, even though Elizabeth was in favour again by autumn 1549.

The seven Elizabeth letters printed here are, in some ways, a disparate mix of overlooked documents. They span nearly a decade, and range from a 100-word note to a three-page exemplification. However, there are thematic consistencies across the letters that provide important insights into Elizabeth's activities and concerns as she established her household and weathered the reigns of her siblings Edward and Mary. All seven are examples of letters of petition, either suits made by Elizabeth on behalf of third parties, for herself, or requests for counsel. It is unsurprising, but worth noting, that the recipients are (to the best of our knowledge) all men. This contrasts with the mixed genders of the addressees of the holograph letters Elizabeth wrote as a princess. The seven scribal letters foreground the lesser-known side of Elizabeth's life during the years before her accession: her participation in the male-dominated spheres of landownership and patronage. Perhaps accordingly, and appropriately therefore, these letters show little evidence of the female epistolary tropes seen in

⁹⁶ Guy, pp. 91-2, 166.

⁹⁷ Parry wrote twice more to Cecil in Sept. 1549, in his first letter describing how Elizabeth 'referres all' to Somerset, and in the second, how, any conversation she had had that might be deemed important, 'shall no soner be in her gr[a]c[e]s hedd then my lord[e]s gr[a]ce shall have intelligence therof'. She was negotiating an audience with the king at the time (T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/8/63 fos. 115-116v; SP 10/8/64 fos. 117-118v).

⁹⁸ The lands were in Maxey, Northamptonshire, and once formed part of the dower of Elizabeth's great grandmother, Lady Margaret Beaufort. In 1537 Cecil's father, Richard Cecil of Stamford in Lincolnshire, had obtained a twenty-one-year lease on them, along with the offices of constable of Maxey Castle and bailiff of the lordship. Cecil succeeded him as constable and bailiff (Northamptonshire Record Office, Fitzwilliam (Milton) Charter (hereafter F.(M.)Ch.), 2285; F.(M.)Ch., 2286; T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/18/15 fos. 27-28v; Brit. Lib., Lansdowne MS. 118 fo. 23; *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, iii. 2074 [5]; xii. i. 1330 [24]; *Cal. Pat. Rolls 1549-51*, pp. 238-42; Bindoff, i. 603; Guy, p. 166.

other female-authored correspondence of the period.⁹⁹ Only in Letter 6 does Elizabeth make any reference to her gender, in regards to ‘the Lordshipp’ of Ewelme, which she is ‘patronesse therof’.

The seven letters were, as has been noted, all written by scribes in secretary hand and signed by Elizabeth. It seems that a number of individuals wrote them: six appear to be in different hands, with only Letters 5 and 6 (of July 1552 and March 1553) showing enough similarities to suggest that they might be by the same person. Several of Elizabeth’s servants during the years 1547 to 1556 are known to have undertaken some secretarial duties, and thus present themselves as possible candidates as the scribes of Letters 1-7. Elizabeth’s tutor, Roger Ascham, acted as her secretary during his time in her household between early 1548 and January 1550. In August 1548 or 1549 Kat Ashley reported how ‘my ladys graces secretary beyng besy w[i]t[h] my lady about hyr lernyng: hyr grace was lothe to let hym: to wrete thes letter’, and later stated that she ‘wold hir [Elizabeth] to write or cawse her secretary to write ^to co[m]fort^’ Seymour, after the death of Katherine Parr in September 1548, ‘& she [Elizabeth] to subscribe’. Presumably, this man was Ascham, unless he only carried out the office of secretary occasionally. The princess refused, saying ‘she shuld be thought to wo [Seymour]’.¹⁰⁰ However, despite Ascham’s attested role in Elizabeth’s correspondence, none of the letters discussed here is in his secretary hand.¹⁰¹ A second candidate is Elizabeth’s cofferer Parry, who David Starkey once memorably dismissed as ‘a fat, self-satisfied Welshman’.¹⁰² In fact, Parry was a central figure in the princess’s household, writing frequently on her business and playing a critical role as an intermediary in communications with Cecil, and acting similarly as a go-between during her detention at Woodstock in 1554-5.¹⁰³ However, his hand is not evident in the seven letters discussed here. Nor did Elizabeth’s chamberlain Sir Walter Buckler act as her scribe.¹⁰⁴ Other potential candidates for the role of Elizabeth’s secretary might be found among those men appointed as clerk of the signet after her accession. Promotion from her household to the signet office, which was under the direction of

⁹⁹ See Daybell 2006, *passim*.

¹⁰⁰ Brit. Libr., Lansdowne MS. 1236 fos. 41r-v; T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/6/19 fos. 51r-v. For Ascham’s place in Elizabeth’s household, see L. V. Ryan, *Roger Ascham* (Stanford, CA, 1963), pp. 102-13.

¹⁰¹ For Ascham’s holograph, see Brit. Libr., Lansdowne MS. 3 fos. 2r-v, 3-4v, 5-6v. He was dismissed in Jan. 1550, probably after some dispute with Parry, and was abroad from Sept. 1550 to Aug. 1553, and thus could not have penned Letters 3, 4, 5, and 6 anyway (Ryan, pp. 111-3, 119-94).

¹⁰² Starkey, p. 77.

¹⁰³ Hatfield, Cecil MS. 151/52; Cecil MS. 151/85; Read, pp. 63-4; Hughes 2004.

¹⁰⁴ For Parry’s holograph, see Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518 fos. 9-10v; for Buckler’s, T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 1/202 fos. 37r-v; *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, xx. i. 920.

her principal secretary Cecil, would be a natural career path. Five men are listed as clerks of the signet in 1558-9, Gregory Railton, John Clyff, William Honynges, Nicasius Yetswert, and Francis Yaxley, all of whom had served Mary as well, thus ruling them out as Princess Elizabeth's secretary.¹⁰⁵ However, John Somer replaced Railton at his death in 1561.¹⁰⁶ Unfortunately, Somer's secretary hand differs from that used in any of our seven letters.¹⁰⁷

It is possible that Elizabeth did not in fact have a full-time secretary before she became queen (apart from briefly in summer and autumn 1548, if Ashley was referring in the two examples cited above to someone other than Ascham). Instead, it is plausible that her correspondence was undertaken by any one of her household servants who had been trained in secretary hand, and whom she trusted. The fact that only Letters 5 and 6 seem to be in the same hand, suggests that this is probably what happened, while Letter 3 of April 1550 (because of the particular neatness and regularity of the hand) appears to have been the work of a professional scribe, although why one should have been employed on this occasion and not on the other six discussed here is unclear.¹⁰⁸ Parry's stepson, John Fortescue (1533-1607) of Shirburn and Stonor Place, Oxfordshire, who entered Elizabeth's service in 1555, would be such a figure. Yet, while his secretary hand bears some resemblance to that used in Letter 7, dated February 1556, the differences between the two would appear to rule him out as its scribe.¹⁰⁹

Although this investigation leaves us at something of a dead end when it comes to identifying who wrote her letters when she did not do so herself, there are nevertheless interesting consistencies (and inconsistencies) in the epistolary practice of Princess Elizabeth and her scribes. The proliferation of letter-writing manuals in the period testifies to the perceived importance of correspondence as a tool for social interaction.¹¹⁰ How one represented oneself on the page, linguistically and materially, was critical to one's relationship with the recipient and the potential outcomes of the letter.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁵ T.N.A.: P.R.O., LC 2/4/2 fo. 27v; LC 2/4/3 p. 110; Bindoff, ii. 383-4; iii. 680-2. For the close relationship between the principal secretary and the clerks of the signet, see A. Johnston, 'William Paget and the late-Henrician polity' (unpublished University of St. Andrews Ph.D. thesis, 2003), pp. 2, 40-1, 65, 105, 110-11, 113-25, 130, 185-6, 214, 234.

¹⁰⁶ T.N.A.: P.R.O., PROB 11/44 sig. 409; *Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1560-3*, p. 100.

¹⁰⁷ T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 70/22 fos. 135-136v; SP 70/22 fos. 137-138v; SP 70/23 fos. 74-75v.

¹⁰⁸ Plas Newydd MSS. uncatalogued 2272.

¹⁰⁹ Longleat, Thynne MS. 1 fos. 4-5v. For Fortescue's holograph, see T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 12/93/1 fos. 1-2v; see Hasler, ii. 148-51; Starkey, pp. 156-7.

¹¹⁰ For example, Angel Day, *The English Secreterie* (1586, *S.T.C.*, no. 6401).

¹¹¹ Daybell 2012, pp. 85-108.

There are two features of the seven letters printed here that warrant a brief comment. One is the form and position of the subscription and signature. In Letters 3-7, Elizabeth signed using variants of ‘Your very loving friend’, a subscription that indicated courtesy but not deference. In Letter 1, which is the most perfunctory of them all, she omitted to use any subscription. Letter 2 is different again: the subscription ‘Your assured frende to my litel power’ is one that she used consistently in letters to Somerset, both during the 1549 crisis and in the scribal letter sent the previous autumn. It is also a subscription Elizabeth used in a letter to Seymour, and seems to have been adopted to signal an appropriate degree of humility and deference when writing to men who were socially superior but not family.¹¹² (By the terms of the 1536 Succession Act, she was recognized as Lady and not as Princess Elizabeth, thus her style in addressing men like the lord protector and his brother Seymour reflected their higher status).

The seven letters also show two kinds of signature positioning. In Letters 1, 4, 6 and 7, Elizabeth signed in the top-left margin; a position the author William Fulwood was later to prescribe as suitable when addressing ‘our inferiour[s]’.¹¹³ In Letters 2, 3 and 5, her signature is below the main body of the letter, positioned centrally: a location approved for correspondence between equals. Given her schooling, it seems likely that Elizabeth was highly attuned to the social signals sent by the signatory display, although her scribes may also have advised her.¹¹⁴

This point links to another feature of these scribal letters, which raises questions about the processes of composition: the presence of the first personal plural pronoun. This occurs in Letter 1, 4 and 7; the other letters use the more conventional first-person singular ‘I’. There is a correlation between pronoun choice and signature position: all plural-voiced letters are signed in the left-hand margin. The one ‘left-handed singular’ exception is the March 1553 letter to Cecil, detailing the situation at Ewelme; this may reflect Elizabeth’s closer relationship with him than with the other addressees of these letters. The pronoun choice is a linguistic tool to signal Elizabeth’s status and authority in relation to the addressee (as it would later do in her official correspondence once

¹¹² For example, T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/5/4 fos. 8A-8Aav; Bodl. Libr., MS. Ashmole 1729 fo. 11; New York, J. Pierpont Morgan Library, MS. Rulers of English, Box III, Part 1, art. 6.

¹¹³ William Fulwood, *The Enimie of Idlenesse* (1568, S.T.C., no. 11476), sig. B2.

¹¹⁴ If Letters 4 and 5 were both, as seems probable, written to Darcy, it is unclear why Elizabeth should have changed the position of her signature from the top-left margin (4) to below the main body of the letter (5). Perhaps addressing the lord chamberlain in her first letter as a social inferior had been a miscalculation.

queen).¹¹⁵ What is striking is that her scribes use the plural pronoun as early as 1547. In the letters using the plural, it is generally consistent: there is one slip in the opening (conventionalised) address in Letter 4, and a correction in Letter 7: 'That who soeu[e]r be ~~myne~~ ovr officer'. (Of course, another question is who made such a correction?) The composition of Princess Elizabeth's holograph and scribal letters warrants further scrutiny. However, what the seven included here shows is that we must consider her well-known holograph letters within the broader context of her household correspondence.

The survival of the eight letters printed here reflects their preservation in different archives. Two of them form part of the family collections of the addressees.¹¹⁶ The five in Additional Manuscript 70518 and the one held in a private collection were all obtained in the early eighteenth century from the antiquarian John Strype by Humfrey Wanley on behalf of his masters, Robert and Edward Harley, first and second earls of Oxford.¹¹⁷ Wanley's annotations appear on all of them. These six letters were retained for some reason, when the majority of the Harley manuscripts were sold to the British Museum in 1753. They eventually found their way to Welbeck Abbey in Nottinghamshire, home of Edward Harley's daughter Margaret Cavendish-Bentinck, duchess of Portland, where they remained until after the Second World War. Five formed part of the Portland Loan to the British Library, but the most remarkable of all, Elizabeth's letter to Somerset of February 1549, was held back. As a result, it has been overlooked by historians. No doubt more of Elizabeth's letters and papers await discovery, as do those of her siblings Edward and Mary.

Appendix 1

Letter 1

¹¹⁵ See Evans, *passim*.

¹¹⁶ Plas Newydd MSS. uncatalogued 2272 (almost certainly); Longleat, Thynne MS. 1 fos. 4-5v (definitely).

¹¹⁷ Brit. Libr., Lansdowne MS. 1238 fos. 2r-3v; *Letters of Humfrey Wanley*, ed. P. L. Heyworth (Oxford, 1989), xx, p. 250; D. Jackson, 'Humfrey Wanley and the Harley collection', *Electronic British Library Journal* (2011), art. 2, 1-20, <<http://www.bl.uk/ebj/2011/articles/article2.html>> [accessed 10 June 2014]).

London, British Library, Add. MS. 70518 fos. 11-12v

31 December [1547]. Enfield. Princess Elizabeth to William Cecil.

[Letter, fo. 11]

[*Scribal*] fforasmuche as this bearer Hugh Goodacar¹¹⁸ hath been
of longe tyme knowen vnto vs to be aswell of honest
conversation and sober lyving, as of sufficient
learninge and Iudgement in the Scriptures to preache
the worde of god, thadvancement wherof we so
desyer, that we wishe ther were many suche to set
furthe godd[e]s glory, We shall therfor desyer yow
that as hertofoer at our request, ye haue obteyned
lycence to preache for dyverse other honest men,
so ye woll commend this same mans cause vnto
my Lorde,¹¹⁹ And therwith p[ro]cure for him the like
lycence as to the other hath been graunted/
ffrom/ Enfelde the last day of December.

[*Holograph*] Elizabeth [*flourish*]¹²⁰

[*Second scribal hand*] ~~Wootton~~

~~Wootton.~~

~~W~~ ~~Wootton.~~¹²¹

¹¹⁸ The librarian Humfrey Wanley has underlined 'Hugh Goodacar' (line 1) and 'Enfelde' (l. 13), annotating the left margin 'Goodacar was after chaplain w[i]th John Bale to Poynt Bishop of Winchester: & thence preferred to ye Archbishopric of Armagh'.

¹¹⁹ Somerset.

¹²⁰ Written in the left margin.

[Letter, fo. 11v]

[Endorsement:]

fro[m] my L[ady] elizab[eth]

[Address leaf, fo. 12v]

[Superscription:]

[*Scribal*] To M[aste]r Cycell

attendinge vpon the

Lorde Protector/¹²²

Letter 2

Private Collection, fos. 9-10v

10 February 1549. Hatfield. Elizabeth to Edward Seymour, duke of Somerset.

[Letter, fo. 9]

[*Scribal*] My verie goode Lorde/ Wheras of laite I wrote vnto your Grace,

as concerninge the slaunderouse rumor, sprong vp of me both in

¹²¹ The identity of the author of these pen trials is unknown. He is not the treasurer of Calais, Sir Edward Wotton of Boughton Malherbe in Kent, nor his brother Dr Nicholas Wotton, dean of Canterbury and York, or son Thomas Wotton (Bindoff, iii. 659-60; L. MacMahon, 'Wotton, Sir Edward (1489?-1551)', *O.D.N.B.* <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29998>> [accessed 10 June 2014]; M. Zell, 'Wotton, Nicholas (c. 1497-1567)', *O.D.N.B.* <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/30002>> [accessed 22 Sept. 2011]). For Sir Edward Wotton's signature, see T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/4/2 fo. 3v; SP 10/8/62 fo. 114; for Dr Nicholas Wotton's, SP 1/227 fo. 183v; *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, xxi. ii. 610; for Thomas Wotton's, SP 12/3/12 fo. 34.

¹²² Wanley has annotated the address leaf: '~~December~~. 35 XLIII. The Lady Elizabeth to M[aste]r Cecyl to procure licence ~~for one~~ from ye L[or]d Protector for Goodacre one., [sic] to preach. VI'.

London and in other partes/ these shall be to certefie your Grace
that the saide rumor is not onelie not diminisskede/ but dailie
more and more in all partes increasede/ to the greate infamie
of my name and greife of my hart Therfor moost hertlie
I desire your Grace and the hole Counsell to p[r]ovide some
remedie in this behalfe/ And, if it might stand well w[i]t[h] your
Gracese aduise and pleasur/ ther is nothinge I would soner wishe
than that I might shortlie se the King his Ma[ies]tie, whiche thing
surelie shoulde be both my greatest comfort, and also in a parte
a staie for the vaine taulke of the people. And thus I com[m]it
your Grace vnto God who kepe you frome Hatfelde the
xth of ffebruary 1549.

[*Holograph*] Your assured frende to my

[*Holograph*] litel power

[*Holograph*] Elizabeth [*flourish*]

[Seal: impression]

[Letter, fo. 9v]

[Letter, fo. 10]

[Address leaf, fo. 10v]

[Superscription:]

[*Scribal*] To my verie goode Lorde
my Lorde P[r]otectors Grace

dd

[Endorsement:]

~~xth February~~/

The Lady Elizabeth

to my .L[ord]. P[rotector].¹²³

[Seal: intact]

Letter 3

University of Wales, Bangor, Paget Papers, Plas Newydd MSS. uncatalogued 2272

21 April 1550. Enfield. Elizabeth to [unknown addressee].¹²⁴

[Letter, recto]

[*Scribal*] My Lorde w[i]th my harty com[m]endac[i]ons Thes ar to pray you bothe to consider w[i]t[h] me that my house is chargeable vnto me this
dere tyme/ And that also I haue but small ground[e]s in hand to releve the prouysions therof./ Herin I
am constrayned earnestlye to
move you to stande w[i]t[h] me agaynst the demaunde of one that names hymselfe to be yo[u]r
s[er]uant for the litle of certen ground[e]s w[hi]che
allwayes weis wont to lye aparte for the prouysion of this house aswell in M[aste]r Lovell[e]s daies
and my lord of Rutland[e]s¹²⁵ as also

¹²³ Wanley expanded 'L.P.' to 'L. Protector.' He has annotated the address leaf: 'N XXXVI. Complaining of a slanderous report raised of her; & desirous to be admitted to ye King. N. XXIV. H. (26).'

¹²⁴ This is a photograph taken in 1927 of a now-lost original; it shows the recto only.

¹²⁵ Sir Thomas Lovell and Thomas Manners, first earl of Rutland.

in latter days sythens/ And I thinck yo[u]r wysdome suche as that ye wold not dymyse those thing[e]s
 frome the house to any
 s[er]uant ye haue and leve the house nakyd therof I assure that yf I should for goo those ground[e]s I
 shuld very wekely cary the
 charge of my thing[e]s about And my trust is that ye will for my sake rather procure more for me then
 ones consent to my
 hynderaunce/ especially when my necessitie is this touched/ And that ye will rather also bere
 toward[e]s me then toward[e]s yo[u]r owne may [*sic*]
 vnto whome for yo[u]r sake (if he can so take it) I wilbe gladd otherwayes to do a good torne vnto/
 and lykewyse ^to^ his children of
 the lyke com[m]oditie as it shall fall w[i]t[h]in thes Lordeshipp[e]s or ell[e]s where ^where^ [*sic*] I
 may graunt it/ It shuld litell content me tunderstand
 that s[er]uant[e]s shuld be ony occasion of onkyndeness w[hi]che in ^suche^ cases somtyme myghte
 be engendryd praying you to be my earnest ffrende
 I pray the lorde pres[er]ue you/ ffrome Enfeld the xxth of Aprill Anno 1550

[*Holograph*] Your louinge frende.

[*Holograph*] Elizabeth [*flourish*]

Letter 4

Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518 fos. 8r-v

20 May [1552]. Hatfield. Elizabeth to [unknown addressee].

[Letter, fo. 8]

[*Scribal*] Good my Lorde, w[i]th our right hartie co[m]mendac[i]ons:

Vndrestanding that Robert Wingfeld¹²⁶ oon ^of^ S[i]r
 Antony Wingfeldes soonnes, now ~~of~~ one of the [*symbol*]
 gentlemen huisschers to the king[e]s ma[ies]tie, doeth [*symbol*]
 entend to geve vpp his ordinary attendaunce in the
 court/ not doubting your Lordeshipps good co[n]formitie
 and readines to show vs all the pleasure you
 can: haue thought good herebye boeth to vse yo[u]r
 friendeshipp/ and to put you to some pains ~~in reue~~
 in reveling our desire in this case to the King[e]s
 Mat[ies]tie That, having w[i]th vs in our houshold
 service a brother¹²⁷ of the saide Rob[er]t Wingfeldes, the
 bearer herof/ a man for his honestie/ sobrietie/
 and vertuous qualities woorthie moch commendac[i]on/
 and a man in deede very painfull/ diligent/ skilfull/
 and serviceable/ very meete to serue in that, [*symbol*]
 or in any other lyke place of p[re]ferment about his [*symbol*]
 highnes: it may please you at thernest co[n]templa=
 c[i]on herof the rather to move the King[e]s Ma[ies]tie
 for him/ as oon[e] meete commended from vs to serue
 the same in this rowm. most humbly beseching his
 highnes taccept him from vs accordingly.
 And herew[i]thall we pray you to be his singulare
 good Lorde/ and to put him forwardes to serue from
 time to time as occasion shall serue you. Thus w[i]th
 o[u]r hartie thank[e]s/ for your former gentlenes we
 co[m]mitt you to the Lorde. At o[u]r manor of Hatfelde

¹²⁶ Wanley has underlined ‘Robert Wingfeld’ (lines 2, 12), ‘Antony Wingfeldes’ (l. 3), and ‘Hatfelde’ (l. 27).

¹²⁷ Anthony Wingfield the younger.

the xxth of May.

[*Holograph*] Your Louinge¹²⁸

[*Holograph*] fre[n]de. Elizabeth [*flourish*]

[Address leaf, fo. 8v]

[Endorsement:]

my Lady Elyzabethe

to my Lord¹²⁹

[Seal: impression]

Letter 5

Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518 fos. 13-14v

16 July 1552. Ashridge. Elizabeth to Thomas, first Lord Darcy of Chiche.

[Letter, fo. 13]

[*Scribal*] Your approved ffrendlie gentilnes by my desires before
hand shewed, good my Lord was a sufficient testimony
vnto me, of youre good will and redines to benyfite me
wythall, by all youre ~~of~~ waies & meanes/ But this

¹²⁸ Written in the left margin.

¹²⁹ '~~To my Lord~~' has been struck through. Wanley annotated the address leaf: 'XXXVIII (as it seems) to the Lo[rd] Chamberlain in the behalf of one ^of the sons of S[i]r Anthony^ Wingfeild [*sic*], to bee preferred to ye Kings service, in ye quality of Gentleman Huisher, in room of his brother Robert, yt was minded to Leave yt place'.

vundesired to this my kynnesman[n] Cary¹³⁰ mak[e]s me to
 thinke myself farre in your debte/ considering your
 earnest frendshipp vnto him for my sake the rather,
 I can but yelde vnto youe my most hartie thank[e]s.
 therefore, vntill I may otherwise recompence youe/
 And herewithall desire youe in like earnest man[ner]
 to p[er]seuer his good Lorde, As ye haue well bigonne.
 And for my sake the rather ^so^ to exercise him in s[er]vice
 of the King[e]s Maiestie, As youe can best. [*symbol*]
 Wherbie, good my Lorde, youe shall not only doo me
 great pleas[u]r, but bynde him; As, I know it,
 ye shall finde him, most dilligent, and towerd,
 for the p[u]rpose, that waie: and vnto youe as trustie,
 faithfull, and redie, as ye haue most bounden[n] him/
 Herew[i]th I doo by him co[m]mend vnto youe the sauffety
 and the Cure of a poore mann, my frend, that moste
 p[ar]te of his lief, hathe s[e]rued my kynne, a poore man[n]
 full of Children[n], but evermore of honestie moche [*symbol*]
 co[m]mendable. w[hi]ch without your aide is vtterlie incurable:
 He becam[e] suerties for S[i]r Iohn[n] Butler decessed in xli
 to one Dorm[er]¹³¹ of London, decessed, for Silk[e]s/ And
 the principall Debttor being not Sued, this poore
 berer was compelled to paie the debte of his owne
 prop[er] good[e]s to thexecutors/ And that notw[i]thstanding
 he is owtlawed. And then in Daunger of his good[e]s
 as ye knowe. And so he, and his, vtterlie vndonne

¹³⁰ Henry Carey.

¹³¹ Sir Robert Dormer.

for ever/ yf therfore yt may please youe to get
him his p[ar]done, w[hi]ch I am dreven to sewe with

[Letter, fo. 13v]

spe[ci]all restituc[i]on for conscience sake every waie, by
reason[n] that the Sute of the lawe, wherby vpon[n] error
yt ys graunted of co[u]rse, is so chardgeable, as all his
good[e]s is not able to relive him, and to bere the burdon[n]
I shall accompt this emongist the rest of youre.
benefyt[e]s, worthie my recompense therfore: To whom
also I beseche youe to be good Lord/ forasmoche the rather
as I haue vnd[e]rtaken[n] to obteyne his p[ar]don/ Wherin I did suspend to ~~see~~
sende vntill now yo[u]r com[m]ing to the Co[u]rte. At Asherudge
the xvjth of Iuly 1552

[Holograph] Your louinge fre[n]de Elizabeth [*flourish*]

[Scribal] post script My Lorde, I praie youe to credite my Cosine Cary
in that he shall declare vnto youe touching Donnyngto[n]¹³²
And some disordres in thes p[ar]tes. Wherof I wolde
be glad to haue youre advise and aide./

/	/	/	/	/	/
/	/	/	/	/	/
/	/	/	/	/	/
/	/	/	/	/	/

¹³² Wanley has underlined 'Donnyngto[n]', annotating the left margin '+ Donington'; other underlined words are 'Cary' (line 5), 'S[ir] Iohn[n] Butler' (l. 24), 'Dorm[er]' and 'London' (l. 25), 'Asherudge' (l. 41), and 'Cary' (l. 44).

[Address leaf, fo. 14v]

[Superscription:]

[*Scribal*] To my good Lord Darcie

Lord Chamberlayne to the

King[e]s Maiestie/

[Endorsement:]

[*Scribal*] xvjth Iuly 1552

My Ladie Elisabeth[e]s

grace to the L[ord]¹³³

[Seal: intact]

Letter 6

Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518 fos. 31-32v

19 March 1553.¹³⁴ Hatfield. Elizabeth to Cecil.

[Letter, fo. 31]

[*Scribal*] Gentill M[aste]r Cicell,¹³⁵ aft[e]r my hartiest com[m]endac[i]ons

¹³³ '~~xvjth Iuly 1552~~' is struck through by Wanley, who also underlined 'Elisabeth[els]'. He annotated the address leaf: 'XXXVII: [L]ord Chamberlain (Lord Darcy). N: ~~XXVI to receive into his service~~ In behalf ^of^ her Cozin Carve to employ him in service about the King HH'.

¹³⁴ Although the letter is dated 'xixth of Marche 1553', and endorsed as such, it cannot be old style, as it is addressed to Cecil as 'Secretarie to the King[e]s Maiestie'.

and my Like thank[e]s for your contynuall paynes
 and redynesses to gratifie me in all myne affaires,
 together w[i]th the ffaithfull and onfayned
 good will towerdes me. Donne me of Late [*symbol*]
 sufficientlie to vnd[e]rstand/ As I haue ben
 and am in many cases yll handeled, So
~~now~~ in thes w[hi]ch now I send youe. am I so
 extremelie handled, As therbie, yf spedie
 remedie be not had, I am like to susteine
 no small dishono[u]r./ And the poore men[n],
 inh[ab]itant[e]s in the Countrey there, Like to be
 vndone for ever/ The case being thus,
 A yong man being Learned, obteyned to be
 Pay Master of myne Almeshouse in Ewelme,
 before the Lordshipp was graunted vnto me
 And before I was patronesse therof.¹³⁶ Sithens
 whose entrie in to his said office, The
 same yonge man[n], w[i]thout all respect of
 honestie, And w[i]thout all considerac[i]on of
 his Dutie towerdes the poore of that house,
 Hathe not onlie embeseled the plate, the
 orname[n]t[e]s and Iewelles, w[i]th the Stocke of
 money of the same to his owne prop[er] vse:
 And Leving the house ~~at~~ a owte of
 all order, goithe himself at Lardge
 as a man w[i]thout regard whervnto he is

¹³⁵ Wanley has underlined 'Cicell' (line 1), 'Ewelme' (l. 15), and 'entrie' (l. 18), annotating the left margin '+Ewelme' and '+~~entrie~~'.

¹³⁶ The lordship of Ewelme was granted to Elizabeth in March 1550 (*Cal. Pat. Rolls 1549-51*, pp. 238-42).

called./ But also hathe, contrarie to the
 foundac[i]one of the house, dymysed certen
 Lordshipp[e]s and Manners belonging to
 (our said Almeshouse in grosse wooddes
 and Tymbe[r] and all, and hath sithens

[Letter, fo. 31v]

the said demyse redymed¹³⁷ the said Leases ~~or~~ [^]good[^] p[ar]te
 therof into his ^owne^ handes./ And hathe by collo[u]r
 therof not onlie solde, felled and wasted
 all the Hedgre Rowes and Trees groing
 in the same, being vp[p]on the ten[an]t[e]s, wherof
 the ten[a]nt[e]s were wont alwaies to haue
 Relefe, w[hi]ch now they never can haue agen[n]:
 But also hathe solde Copie holdes to
 Strangers from[n] the poore Ten[a]nt[e]s contrary
 to the Custome And that more is,
 goithe aboute to Compasse ~~by~~ his [*symbol*]
 Complices, that a faire called wey hill
 feyre, being kept vpon[n] one of the said
 Manners, sholde be transposid from the
 said Man[n]er to a Towne called Andiver,¹³⁸
 to the vtter ruyne of the poore ten[a]nt[e]s and
 Inh[ab]itant[e]s therabout[e]s for ever, w[hi]ch matter,
 being as in respect of me and the interest

¹³⁷ The manors of Marsh Gibbon in Buckinghamshire, Conock in Wiltshire, and Ramridge in Hampshire. Wanley has underlined 'wey hill' (line 12) and 'Andiver' (l. 15), annotating the left margin '~~+redymed~~', '~~+Tenants~~', and '~~+enormities~~'.

¹³⁸ Weyhill is half a mile south of Ramridge and three miles west-south-west of Andover in Hampshire.

of the house, a private matter, They
 gooe aboute to compasse by Acte of p[ar]liame[n]t,
 My said interest and thinterest of the
 said Almeshouse never hard./ The
 other enormyt[ie]s, donne by him, ar to longe
 to write/ wherfore for this tyme I omytt
 them. Praieng youe so to vse this matter
 for me, As I may haue some due meanes
 to reforme this from the Roote vpward/
 I had thought and yet doo, to haue sent
 doune certen of myne officers in visitac[i]on,
 and therbie ~~to~~ vpon[n] certificat ageenst him
 to haue removed him. and to haue putt in a
~~new~~ newe. w[hi]ch thing I suspended vntill now.¹³⁹

[Letter, fo. 32]

And in the meane season I haue sent for the
 said Paymaster, whose name is Key,¹⁴⁰ to
 aunswere to thobiect[e]s, who as he is
 some thing learened, So yt app[er]ith well,
 he is nothing at all meate for the
 Rome./ I haue sent Likewise for the
 Sequestrac[i]on of the residue of the
 woodd[e]s vnto suche tyme my pleasure
 be further knowen./ In this, gentill M[aste]r

¹³⁹ The visitor was the lord of the manor, that is, Elizabeth. Visitations were meant to be carried out annually (*Victoria County History of Oxfordshire*, ii. 156).

¹⁴⁰ Thomas Caius, fellow of University College, Oxford.

Cicell, I praie youe as concerni[n]g the
 feyre being a private matter. And being
 a feyre thes iiij^C yeares at wey hill
 And being l [*sic*] myne interest, I praie youe
 to staie for me/ for the residue to declare
 your best advise to Tresham,¹⁴¹ howe I
 may best wade therin as maie app[er]teine
 to myne hono[u]r/ whom I haue com[m]aunded to
 waite vp[p]on youe for the p[ur]pose/ I wolde
 haue sent parry¹⁴² vnto youe, were yt not that
 as youe know my house is w[i]thout officers, to
 whom[e] in his absence I pray youe to be good
 in suche affaires, as he hathe comy[m]tted
 to Tresh[a]m to be donne vnto youe/ the
 rather at my desire. Thus w[i]th my hartie
 thank[e]s ageine I com[m]yt youe to the Lord.
 At Hatfild the xixth of Marche 1553

[Holograph] Your lovinge frende/

[Holograph] Elizabeth [*flourish*]¹⁴³

[Address leaf, fo. 32v]

[Superscription:]

[Scribal] To myne assured

¹⁴¹ This is probably George Tresham of Newton-in-the-Willows or his kinsman and namesake, the third son of Sir Thomas Tresham of Rushton. Wanley has underlined 'key' (line 2), 'Cicell' (l. 10), 'wey hill' (l. 12), 'Tresh[a]m' (ll. 15, 23), 'Parry' (l. 19), and 'Hatfild' and '1553' (l. 26), annotating the left margin '~~+The[m]as~~ Tresham'.

¹⁴² Thomas Parry.

¹⁴³ Written in the top left margin (fo. 31).

ffreynd S[i]r Will[ia]m
 Cicell[e] knight [*symbol*]
 Secretarie to the King[e]s
 Maiestie./

[Endorsement:]

[*Cecil's holograph*] 1553

19 Mar[ch] Lady Elysabeth¹⁴⁴

[Seal: intact]

Letter 7

Wiltshire, Longleat House, Thynne MS. 1 fos. 4-5v

27 February 1556. Hatfield. Elizabeth to Sir John Thynne.

[Letter, fo. 4]

[*Scribal*] After our Right hartie com[m]endac[i]ons touching M[aste]r
 Kingesmylle,¹⁴⁵ whose wisdom and approved faithfulness
 youe haue somoche commended vnto vs/ Thoccasion [*symbol*]
 is now presently so offred. as that we haue thought
 this tyme to be moste conuenye[n]t to write vnto youe
 in that case/ We praye you therfor, as we trust

¹⁴⁴ '~~1553 ... 19 Mar[ch]~~' is struck through by Wanley, who has also underlined 'Elysabeth'. He annotated the address leaf: 'XLVI.', '~~Mar[ch]~~ 19', 'The ... to S[i]r W[illia]m Cecyl: complaining of ye abuses done in a Mannor of hers by her Paymaster: & desiring his advices. N. XXV. VIII'.

¹⁴⁵ Richard Kingsmill of Lincoln's Inn.

you, to consider therof accordingle and on suche [*symbol*]
 weise (of yo[u]r owne hedd industry and good mynde)
 to travaill vnto him as that without delaye we may
 haue him to be resident to s[er]ue vs in our howse/
 We write no farther circu[ms]tanc[e]s herof for this tyme
 bicause ye know sufficiently the state we ar in [*symbol*]
 and also what behoves vs/ Shew of yo[u]rselfe
 in this case the good effect of owr truste we pray
 you. that if eu[e]r it lye in vs we may condignely [*symbol*]
 acquite it. And herew[i]th that yo[u]r doing[e]s be so
 discreately handelyd for the respect of o[u]r honour
 that our spedy atteynyng of him may hoollye
 p[ro]cede of his good Labo[u]r and meanes. Thus we
 comyt youe to god. At our Mano[u]r of hatfelde the
 xxvith of februarie 1555

[*Holograph*] Your verye fre[n]de/

[*Holograph*] Elizabeth [*flourish*]¹⁴⁶

[*Scribal*] Post[sc]ript. Yf ye shall think it expedient/ we can be co[n]tented
 that in your treaty w[i]th him ye signifie for our [*symbol*]
 behalf. that as befor tyme we were pleased to let
 others our officers. to goo to see ~~own~~ therr owne
 whiles others attendyd That who soeu[e]r be ~~myne~~
 owr officer shall not be tyed to contynewall
 residence in o[u]r house as therby he shuld be dryven
 to dissolue his howse and famylie & the state

¹⁴⁶ Written in the top left margin.

therof. but that he com[e] to s[er]ue in tymes of others
 absenc[e]s and tymes appoynted fare ye well¹⁴⁷

[Address leaf, fo. 5v]

[Superscription:]

[*Scribal*] To our assurid

Loving freende S[i]r

Iohn Thynne knight

[Endorsement:]

[*Scribal*] My Lady Elizabeth

hir grace Re[ceived] 3 M[ar]cij

1556

[Seal: intact]

Appendix 2

Brit. Libr., Add. MS. 70518 fos. 9-10v

20 September [1549 or 1555]. Hatfield. Thomas Parry to Cecil.

[Letter, fo. 9]

¹⁴⁷ Canon John Jackson annotated the letter: '27 2 1555/6', 'The Princess [after[war]ds Q[ueen]] Elizabeth to Sir John Thynne from Hatfield 1555', 'The signature on the margin', 'original sign manual.' He also made his own transcription (Longleat, Thynne MS. 1 fo. 4; Thynne MS. 1 fos. 6r-v; G. Goodwin, 'Jackson, John Edward (1805-1891)', rev. P. Rundle, *O.D.N.B.* <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14537>> [accessed 23 Aug. 2012]).

[*Holograph*] S[i]r. her gr[a]ce¹⁴⁸ hathe com[m]anded me to write her hartie com[m]e[n]dations & thank[e]s vnto youe/ And also herewith to sende yo[u]r s[er]u[a]nt Bryce,¹⁴⁹ whome her gr[a]ce dothe p[re]ferre vnto you/ to thentent ye may know him & com[m]and yo[u]r pleaser of him/ And that he may also know, that ye haue accepted him to yo[u]r s[er]uice, her gr[a]ce hathe also com[m]anded me to say to you, that she assureth you, that he will s[er]ue you very honestly.

And as concernyng her gr[a]c[e]s stile/ her gr[a]ce desireth you to take som[e] leysur, and to devise ~~you~~ that as ye shall thinke good/ And to send it her gr[a]ce close in writing by this said berer./ And when she hathe seen[e] yo[u]r mynde, you shall here agayne from[e] her gr[a]c[e] of her plesuer herof/ she desires you to adu[er]tise her by l[ett]re to be sent by this berer./

Sir, I haue not herd any word of Owterede¹⁵⁰ as yet, but the soner he com[m]es the better wellcom[e]/ Thus I Pr[a]y Criste geve you that you moste desire & p[re]s[er]u[e] you eu[e]r/ hastily this friday night at hatfelde.

[*Holograph*] Yo[u]r[e]s assurid eu[e]r to com[m]aund

[*Holograph*] Thom[a]s Parry [*flourish*]

[*Holograph postscript*] S[i]r vpon wensday¹⁵¹ com[e] sevenyght does her gr[a]c[e]

¹⁴⁸ Elizabeth. Certain words are marked or underlined by Wanley, with annotations above the line or in the margin: 'grace' and '+grace' (line 1), 'herd' and '+Owterede' (l. 15), '+pray', 'Christ', and '+preserve' (l. 17), '+ever' and '+Hatfelde' (l. 18).

¹⁴⁹ Richard Bryce, deputy keeper of Hatfield.

¹⁵⁰ Ughtred. He acted as bearer for several of Elizabeth's letters, often conveying verbal messages too. His Christian name is never given (T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 10/8/64 fos. 117-118v; SP 10/10/12 fos. 26-27v; SP 10/10/33 fos. 73-74v).

remove to Asheridge/ god willing.

[Address leaf, fo. 10v]

[Superscription:]

[*Scribal*] To the right worshipfull M[aste]r

Cicil Esquier.

[Endorsement:]

[*Scribal*] xxth Septemb[er]

ffrom M[aste]r Parry

to my M[aste]r¹⁵²

[Seal: impression]

¹⁵¹ Either 2 Oct. 1549 or 2 Oct. 1555.

¹⁵² '~~xxth Septemb[er]~~', '~~ffrom~~' are struck through. Wanley himself struck through '~~to my M[aste]r~~', replacing it with 'XLIV to Mr Cecyl, by Com[m]nadme[n]t [*sic*] of y^e Lady Elizabeth. Recom[m]ending one to his service. Concerning her Graces stile. Yt he would devise it, & send it her. Sept[ember] 20th'.